

AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XL.—JANUARY, 1878.

THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON THE ROMAN LAW.

PART FIRST—CHAPTER IV.

Philosophic Epoch of the Roman Law. Birth of the Christian Element.

Philosophy, then, has made its entrance into the Roman law; it has broken the inflexible circle marked out by the patriciate. The philosophic epoch commences; its initial moment is in the age of Cicero. We see it enlarging little by little, especially under the influence of Stoicism; we shall prove, however, that Stoicism is far from having done all, and that from Nero even to Constantine the civil law also felt that indirect influence of Christianity by which all things were impressed.

The epoch of Cicero was that of a great intellectual movement. The Greek philosophy which had made an irruption into Rome, and the teachings of the rhetoricians, so much dreaded by the friends of ancient¹ customs, had introduced the young to the boldest innovations.² Epicurus, especially had found in the Senate and at the bar, as well as among the orators and poets,³ some in-

¹ In 661, the censors Licinius Crassus and Domitius Ahenobarbus, declared that such teachings were, to them, a subject of displeasure.—Suet. *de claris rhet.* I Cicero de orat. 24.

² *Novum genus disciplinae.* Cato was its adversary. Pliny, xxix, 7.

³ Caesar and Lucretius. Caesar, in his celebrated discourse to the Senate on the conspiracy of Catiline, denies the penalties of the future life.—Sall. 51.—Cicero says as much in his plea for Cluentius, 61. But it is to be remarked that in what concerns Cicero, the denial of the future life is, if I may so speak, only a plea of court, 50. What an auditory that, which could listen without disfavor to such a discourse.

fatuated disciples.¹ His doctrines pushed to the extreme by some inexorably logical minds—Rome had so many such—had shaken the faith in religion,² institutions and ancestors. It was in vain that Stoicism³ urged against the voluptuous indifference of the sceptics, its austere maxims and exalted principles, last bulwark of the decaying republic, last refuge of grand disheartened souls.

But Stoicism itself was only an opposing force, added to the opposition which everywhere prevailed. In struggling against the political tyranny, which substituted itself for the ancient Roman constitution, it exalted the liberty of man and pushed him in the way of resistance, even to the fatal extremity of suicide. It taught him to break his terrestrial bonds in order to pass the limits of the finite.

The Stoic philosophy inclined, moreover, towards Spiritualism⁴ a doctrine so consoling and especially necessary, in the midst of great political misfortunes; but a doctrine, also, which harmonized very little with the superstition of material forms, upon which reposed the entire political and religious edifice of the republic.

When the Stoic denied his pain upon the bed of suffering, what more fervid denial of sensualism, what more intrepid protestation

¹ Montesq., *Grand. et Decad.* c. x.

² The terrible picture of *Religion* drawn by Lucretius—Bk. I., Verse 64–102—in order to display the magnanimity of his philosophic hero in opposing her, is thought to be designed with great boldness and spirit. Burke on the *Sublime and Beautiful*. The obscurity with which the picture is drawn heightens its terror and calls to mind the description of the spirit in Job: "A spirit passed before my face; it stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof," as well as that of Death in Milton. "If shape it might be called that shape had none distinguishable." Good and others have translated *religione*, the religion of Lucretius, as *Superstition*.

This, however, is a mistake, as Epicurus and Lucretius aimed their blows against the heathen superstition as a *Religion*. See *Lucretius*, translation by Watson and Good.

³ The first representative of Stoicism at Rome was Panetius, friend of Polybius and of Scipio Africanus. Vide *Mem de l'Acad. des inscript.* 1736 X. p. 75–88.—*Mem de M. l'Abbé Sevin*.

⁴ As opposed to materialism.

of the spiritual against the material! And when he urged himself to voluntary death by the contemplation of the immortality of the soul,¹ what revolt more terrible against materialism, than that which does not endure even the ties of life!

Between these two sects was placed a numerous class of thinkers, whom I should call Eclectics, if I had no fear of committing an anachronism by the expression; of these Cicero was the most eloquent and illustrious representative.

A sympathy which enlightened all about it attached this class to the philosophy of Plato; it loved to raise itself with him upon the wings of intelligence, towards the sublime regions of idealism and abstract thought. But it modified its brilliant dreams, sometimes by the experimental method of Aristotle and at others by the doctrines more positive and more austere of the Porch. It is in that spirit that he has composed both his admirable treatise on *Duties*, a work so wise and exalted that it is only surpassed by the Gospel, and his treatise on *Divination* and the *Nature of the Gods*, master pieces of a philosophy so pure that they shared the honor of being burned by order of Dioclesian with books of the Christian religion.²

¹ Cato of Utica committed suicide after hearing of the decisive victory of Caesar over Scipio at Thapsus and spending the night in reading Plato's *Phædo*, which represents Socrates, on the morning of his execution, as holding a conversation with his friends on the immortality of the soul. Cato, however, could not have found anything in the *Phædo* favoring suicide; on the contrary nothing is clearer than that both Socrates and Plato considered suicide as an act of rebellion against the authority of God. Suicide was neither forbidden by the law, nor discountenanced by the public opinion of the Romans, except in the case of soldiers, but by the law of England it is a crime. Says Cicero,—*Vision of Scipio*—“Preserve your souls in the keeping of your bodies; nor are you, without the order of that Being who bestowed them upon you, to depart from mundane life, lest you seem to desert the duties which God has assigned you.”—Cicero on *Old Age* and *Friendship*.

² A. D., 302. Many Romans, says Gibbon—Chap. xv.—were desirous that the writings of Cicero should be condemned and suppressed by authority of the Senate. *Cumque alios audiam mussitare indignantur et*

In politics, Cicero is what we should to-day call a conservative. But his preference for the existing state of things was not blind; it sometimes allied itself with the bold assurance of the critic. He who had been, and perhaps because he had been augur, composed an ingenious satire upon the Etruscan science of divination.¹ Magistrate and jurisconsult he turned into ridicule with that lively and piquant grace which characterized him, the formal science of the jurisconsults, their superstitious respect for the arrangement of words and syllables, their submission to sacramental forms, their minute rites of legal actions, and the arbitrary fictions of their jurisprudence.²

And if we reflect that the civil law, with its discretionary tyranny, and its materialism construed at pleasure, was closely connected with the constitution of the State, and that, nevertheless, Cicero diverted himself, at its expense, in one of his arguments the most capable of captivating the public attention, we shall easily comprehend that the preponderance of the old element was singularly compromised, and that equity, its young rival, was on the way to the most rapid success. The prætors began, in fact, to take it openly under their protection. Under the pretext of interpreting the written law they softened its rigor by innovations more or less shy, more or less circuitous, but always impressed with an equitable sentiment which found Rome impassive in the preceding ages.

Cicero especially, in all the parts which his universal genius played, was one of the most ardent apologists of Natural Law and

dicere oportere statui per senatum, aboleantur et hæc scripta quibus Christiana Religio comprobetur et vetustalis opprimatur auctoritas. Erroris convincite Ciceronem—nam interciperè scripta, et publicatam velle submergere lectionem non est Deum defendere sed veritatis testificationem timere. *Arnobius adversus gentes* l. iii, p. 103-4.

¹ *De Divinat.* II, 4.

² *Pro Murena* 12, 13. Certain symbolical forms and verbal expressions were in early times essential features of the Roman civil process, and were to be observed to the very letter; otherwise the whole proceeding was void. See also Chap. vi below.—Gaius, Tomk. and Lem. Ed. p. 604.

of Equity. Prætor, he boastingly placed it at the head of his edicts.¹ Philosopher and statesman, he declared that it is not to the Twelve Tables that we should go to discover the source and rule of right, but to the depths of reason;² that law is equity, the supreme intelligence engraven upon our nature,³ inscribed upon our hearts, immutable, eternal, whose voice defines our duties, from whose power the Senate cannot enfranchise us, whose empire extends to every people; the law which God alone has expressed, examined and published.⁴

Various causes thus contributed to unsettle the faith in the old Italic wisdom in that formalism with which it enveloped man in order to govern him. Application of materialism to the laws which control political affairs that wisdom found in the neo-materialists become sceptics, votaries of but little zeal; religion of the past, it permitted a desire for the grandest progress to the friends of the past, spiritualized as they were by philosophy.⁵

¹Ad Attic, vi, 1.—Edit. Panck. t. xx, p. 302. Epist. 252.

²It is not in the edict of the magistrate, nor in the Twelve Tables as the ancients maintained, but in the sublimest doctrines of philosophy that we must seek for the true source and obligation of jurisprudence. Cicero *de legibus*, lib. I, 5.

³See Cicero's *officiis*, I, 7, where these ideas are applied to the law of property, and where he holds that by nature no property is private and that no one can covet another's property without violating the laws of society. Modern jurists and moralists have given this subject much attention, and among them *Locke*.

⁴The sentiments here expressed are those which Lactantius and Augustine affirm to have been held by Cicero in his *De Republica*, III, 22.

⁵Antistius Labeo and Ateius Capito, two eminent jurists of the time of Augustus, were founders of schools which maintained opposite theories in regard to law. Labeo, in whom a broader culture had instilled a love for general principles, did not hesitate to make such innovations as he conceived reason and philosophy to require. Capito was distinguished for adhering to the law as he had received it. Labeo ingenii qualitate et fiducia doctrinæ, qui et in cæteris sapientiæ partibus operam dederat, plurima innovare statuit. Ateius Capito in his quæ ei tradita erant perseverabat. Dig. I, ii. 2—47, de origine juris—Labeo was a great conservative however in politics and is said to have been a Stoic. Pothier, *Pand. Pref. t. I* p. xx, and p. xlv.

The jurisconsults who flourished after Cicero were generally inspired by Stoicism, which gave them severe and exact rules of conduct among men.¹ All that is moral and philosophic in the Roman law, from the time of Labeo, that Stoic innovator,² even to that of Gaius and Ulpian, is borrowed from that school which grew rapidly into favor among those chosen minds whose brilliancy shone here and there during the empire. But the philosophy of that school should not be misunderstood. The Stoicism of Seneca, Marcus Aurelius³ and of Epictetus has not the narrow and harsh proportions which make us smile, with Cicero, at the caprice of Cato⁴ and Tubero;⁵ it has arisen to purer and more exalted⁶ forms. Less intolerant and harsh, it is more thoroughly redeemed from the superstitions with which reason reproached it at the time of its first conquests at Rome.⁷ It is more and more a spiritual philosophy, proclaiming the government of divine Providence, the kinship of all men and the power of natural equity.

But at that epoch some important events had transpired in the Orient. The Cross upon which Christ had been sacrificed had become the standard of a religion destined to regenerate the world, and the Apostles had already departed from Judea, bringing to the nations the evangelic word. All the civilizing principles disseminated in the various schools of philosophy which divided the leading minds of Pagan society Christianity took possession of,

¹ Cujas. *Observat.* lib. xxvi, C. ult.—Gravina *de ortu et progressu juris* § 44.

² Pomponius, l. 24. § 47, D., *de Origine juris*. See note 2, p. 54.

³ See what Gibbon says of his sublime meditations. Chap. ii.

⁴ Cicero, *pro Murena*, 29. ⁵ Cicero *in Brutum*, 31. Tubero was a celebrated jurisconsult of the time of Cicero.

⁶ Herder has observed it.—*Philosophie de l'histoire de l'humanité*. liv. xiv, c. v. translated by M. Quixet, t. iii, p. 70.

⁷ Cicero, *de Divinat* lib. i, 3, 6, 20, 30, 39, 52 and lib. ii, 41. The doctrines of the Porch are thus given by Tacitus Hist. iv, 5. Doctore, sapientius secutus est, qui sola bona quæ honesta, mala tantum quæ turpia; potentiam nobilitatem, cæteraque extra animum neque bonis neque malis adnumerant. There is nothing positively good but the honorable, nothing evil but vice, while power, nobility and other things foreign to the soul are neither good nor evil.

with greater wealth, and especially with the advantage of a homogeneous system where all the great truths were co-ordinated with an admirable whole and placed under the guardianship of an ardent faith. Moreover, from that vase of earth which, as Saint Paul said, contained the treasures of Jesus Christ' burst forth those ideas of morality which found the masses forsaken by philosophy and revealed to them the true destiny of humanity both in this world and in the world to come.

Christianity, in fact, was not merely an improvement upon the truths received before it, which it enlarged, completed and re-clothed in a character more sublime and with a power more sympathetic; but it literally was, even for the most incredulous, a descent of the Holy Spirit upon the classes disinherited from learning and plunged into the darkness of polytheism.

The ancient philosophy, with all its merits, was guilty of the unpardonable crime of being indifferent to the wrongs of humanity. Confined to the domain of speculation, to the advantage of a few chosen minds, it was an occupation or amusement of the intellect, an attempt always energetic and courageous to reform society as a whole and to wrest it from an acquaintance with corruption and inhumanity. It wanted charity, that virtue which is the particular inspiration of Christianity, and knew not how to comprehend that virtue either in its practical development or logical extent.

I admit that humanity was not unknown to the exalted Plato; but prejudices more powerful than philosophy restricted the notion with him to the people of Greece alone, beyond whom he only saw inequalities, antitheses and the law of force. Cicero doubtless reached a still more exalted conception when, in the very midst of Roman egotism, he represented all men as fellow-citizens of a common country.²

¹ II Corinthians, iv, 7.

² The entire universe, says Cicero, *de legibus* i, 7, may be regarded as forming one vast commonwealth of gods and men. Where reason is common, right reason must also be common to the same parties; and since right reason is what we call law, God and men must be associated by law and by a communion of rights; and those having law and rights

But that municipal union drawn by philosophy from the identity of laws is only a timorous thought in comparison with the bond of fraternity which unites all men in Christian citizenship. Seneca went one step farther than Cicero in transforming this common country into a single family, of which we are all members.¹ But Christianity surpassed even this; for it proclaimed not only the kinship, but even the fraternity and solidarity universal,² and established upon that foundation its affectionate morality of charity and equality; and its constant practice of abnegation and sacrifice and of disinterested assistance to others.

Thus, then, while philosophy uttered from its intellectual heights the fragments and rudiments of human perfection, Christianity brought to the nations the principles of such perfection completely developed and applied them immediately to all classes of society; its courage to undertake should have sufficed to announce it as a new kind of wisdom distinct from Pagan philosophy.³

The gifts of its philosophic programme have been clearly stated in the writings of Saint Paul. Leaving aside all the theological portion, which is not of my subject, I will present a brief *resumé* of the ideas of the natural law, which the Christian apostle has popularized.

The earth is inhabited by a great family of brethren, children of the same God and governed by the same law, from Jerusalem

in common must be members of the same commonwealth. *Inter quos porro est communio legis, inter eos communio juris est. Quibus autem hæc sunt inter eos communia, et civitatis ejusdem habendi sunt.....ut jam universus hic mundus, una civitas communis deorum atque hominum existimanda.*

¹ *Philosophia docuit colere divina, humana diligere, et penes deos imperium esse, inter homines consortium.*—Epist. 90—*Homo, sacra res homini—omne hoc, quod vides, quo divina atque conclusa sunt, unum est: membra sumus corporis magni. Natura nos cognatos edidit, quum ex iisdem et in eadem gigneret. Hæc nobis amorem indidit mutuum et sociabilis fecit.* Epist. 95.

² If one member suffers all suffer with him. I. *Corinth.*, xii, 26.—*Romans*, xii, 10, 16.

³ I *Corinth.* i, 20. ii, 6, 8. 12. iii, 19. *Ephesians*, ii, 6.

even to the confines of Spain.¹ The barriers of separation are broken asunder, and the enmities which separate men must be extinguished.²

Cosmopolitism, which is the love of humanity on the grandest scale, succeeds to the hatred of cities, and Christianity makes no exception of Greek or barbarian, wise or simple,³ Jew or Gentile.⁴ This new law, which comes to rejuvenate humanity, has not for its object the subversion of the authority of established governments.⁵ It is true that it recognizes among the feeble and oppressed rights which the powerful are bound to respect. Of masters it commands gentleness and justice towards their servants,⁶ and to fathers it says do not provoke your children⁷ to anger. But it does not violently overthrow institutions consecrated by time. It does not excite the slave against the master,⁸ the son against the father⁹ or the wife against the husband.¹⁰ It commands positively that princes and magistrates be obeyed.¹¹

But the yoke from which it *does* enfranchise man, without delay or regard, is that of the material and sensual,¹² in order to render to the spiritual its divine superiority. What are the fruits of materialism? profligacy, idolatry, enmities, murders, etc.¹³ Did not Roman society present the sorrowful spectacle of those corruptions?¹⁴ What on the contrary are the fruits of the Spirit? Charity, peace, patience, humanity, goodness and chastity.¹⁵ The Spirit, however, does not therefore become extinct,¹⁶ but is substituted for the flesh and also for the letter of the law; for the new law is spiritual,¹⁷ living by truth and not by forms,¹⁸ and no longer

¹ Romans, xv, 24-28. ² Ephesians, ii, 14.

³ Romans, i, 14. ⁴ Idem, x, 12.

⁵ Ephes. ii, 6. ⁶ Romans, xiii, 1.

⁷ Ephes. vi, 5-10. Coloss. iv, 1. ⁸ Ephes. vi, 4. Coloss. iii, 20, 21, 23.

⁹ I. Corinth. vii, 21, 22. ¹⁰ Coloss. iii, 20, 21, 23.

¹¹ Ephes. v, 22, 23, 24. ¹² Titus, iii, 1.

¹³ Romans, i, 23, 24; ii, 25-29; vi, 12, 13, 14; vii, 14; viii, 5, 6, 7. I. Corinth. ii, 15; II. Corinth. iii, 7, 8. Galat. v, 19-25; vi, 15. Ephes. ii, 15.

¹⁴ Galat. v, 19, 20, 21. ¹⁵ Romans i, 26, 27. ¹⁶ Galat. v, 22, 23. ¹⁷ I. Thess. v, 19. ¹⁸ Romans, vii, 14; II. Corinth. iii, 7, 8. ¹⁹ Romans ii, 25-29.

encumbered with so many precepts and ordinances¹ in which the spirit is at war with the letter. The new law recommends men to be united by a community of affection,² to have toward each other a fraternal tenderness, to consider themselves members the one of the other,³ to assist each other by sincere⁴ charity, not to return evil for evil,⁵ but to love their neighbors as themselves,⁶ and to know that where one suffers all suffer with him.⁷

Before God all are equal, forming but one body, Jews, Gentiles and slaves,⁸ and all are free or called to a state of freedom,⁹ for Providence is equal to all¹⁰ and the earth belongs to the Lord with everything therein.¹¹ Moreover, if the truth be persecuted, the Christian does not, like the Stoic, take refuge in voluntary death, but suffers while blessing his persecutors,¹² and resists with firmness, arming himself, like an intrepid warrior, with the buckler of faith, the helmet of salvation and the sword of the spirit.¹³

Such was the morality which was going to establish itself in the face of a society, armed at every point with haughty inequalities, abandoned by religious¹⁴ faith, but subject to laws of iron,¹⁵ which had not, however, prevented doubt and corruption from¹⁶ insinuating themselves everywhere.

There were, nevertheless, some living forces in that society; but they were *discouraged* or *oppressed*. The former having escaped

¹ Ephes. ii, 15. ² Romans xv, 5.

³ Romans xii, 5. ⁴ Romans xii, 8, 9, 13. I. Corinth. xiii, 4. ⁵ Romans xii, 17. ⁶ Romans xiii, 9. ⁷ Corinth. xii, 26.

⁸ Romans ii, 11.—I. Corinth. xii, 13.—Galat. iii, 28. ⁹ Galat. iv, 31. ¹⁰ Galat. v, 3.

¹¹ Ephes. iv, 6. ¹² Corinth. x, 26.

¹³ Romans, xii, 4. ¹⁴ Ephes., vi, 33, et seq.

¹⁵ Felix, qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas,
Atque metus omnes, et inexorabile fatum
Subjecit pedibus, strepitumque Acherontis avari!

Virg. Georg. II, v. 490-492.

¹⁶ nec ferrea jura

Inanumque forum, aut populi tabularia vidit.

Virg. Georg. II, v. 501.

from Pharsalia¹ oscillated between outbursts of haughty resistance and despair of the commonwealth, while the latter, younger, but restrained by slavery, by the paternal power, by the exclusive laws of alienage, and by all the chains, in fine, which the ancient aristocracy had forged, awaited in secret fermentation some momentous and mysterious event.

The oracles had predicted a fatal epoch; a crisis of humanity had been promised, and all eyes were turned with hopeful anxiety towards that future which, under the auspices of a Divine child, would enfranchise the world and open to man the noblest destinies.² Among those elements too diverse to have anything in common save their uneasiness were those who live for the present, effeminate egoists, bearing with their liberty the servitude of vice and the shameful yoke of the sybarite. Here were the en-

¹The poem of Lucan, written under Nero, is an honor paid to the conquered of Pharsalia. The poet weeps over Pompey, exalts Brutus and deifies the virtue of Cato. It is an expression of the sentiments of one who had survived the fall of the republic.

²This sentiment is expressed in the fourth Eclogue of Virgil as follows:

Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminis ætas:
Magnus ab integro sæculorum nascitur ordo.
Now comes the last age of the Cumean song
The great order of ages again begins.

vers. 4-5.

Jam nova progenies cælo demittitur alto.
Now a new progeny is sent down from high heaven.

ver. 7.

This sentiment was generally prevalent. Suetonius—Oct. Aug. 94, says, *Prodigium Romæ factum publice, quo denunciabatur, regem populo Romano naturam parturire*. Cicero, *de Divinat.* ii, 54, says, *Cum antistitibus agamus, ut quidvis potius ex illis libris, quam regem proerant*. Let us arrange with the priests that they may prophesy anything but a king from those mysterious volumes.

See also I. *Epist. ad Cluent.* The Fathers of the Church appealed to the Sibylline verses, to which Virgil and others refer, as prophecies foretelling the coming of Christ, the new progeny or King sent down from heaven.

franchised whom the civil wars had thrown *en masse* into the order of citizens and who had carried thither riches badly acquired, the insolence of the parvenu and all the vices of hearts visited by fortune, before receiving the culture which fortifies against its dangers. There, in the more elevated and polished circles, were all the ambitions, so ardent of old, but now exhausted or chilled, who had distinguished themselves in the sorrowful epoch of the triumvirate by their traffic in public weal,¹ by the purchase and sale of judgments,² by false oaths³ and by contempt

¹Cicero *ad Attic.* iv, 16 and 18. The traffic in consciences was public. Ammonius legatus—says Cicero in one of his letters to Lentulus—*aperti pecunia nos oppugnat.*—*Ad famil.* I, 1, p. 36—We are acquainted, moreover, with the more ancient saying of Jugurtha. *O verbum venalem!* The historian Sallust, who practised most profitably the vices which he eloquently censured, adorned his palace and gardens on the Quirinal hill with the plunder of Numidia. Gibbon, Chap. xxxi.

²The corruption among the judges was frightful. Cicero is constantly pointing it out in his letters as notorious. De Proclio rumores non boni, *sed judices nostri!!* ... Deinde Pompei mira contentio, *judicium sordes.... Sed omnes absolventur, nec posthac quisquam damnabitur, nisi qui hominem occiderit.*—*Ad Attic.* iv, 16, ed. Panc, t. xix, p. 296, 300, 303.

³Cicero gives a memorable example of the immorality of the higher classes. The consuls, he says, have lost reputation since Mummius read in full Senate the agreement which he and his competitor made with them. The terms of that agreement were that, if the consuls of that year would secure the election of Mummius and his competitor for the year following, they would either pay those Consuls 400,000 Sesterces, or furnish them with three augurs who would affirm that they were present when the *lex curiata* was passed, which law had only been proposed; and two officers of Consular rank who would swear that they were present when the decree was drawn up for regulating the government of the provinces of those very consuls, although the senate had not even been in session (*Ad Attic.*, iv, 18) in regard to which Montesquieu, writes, What! dishonest parties in only one contract!—*Grand. et decad.* chap. x.

In the argument of Cicero for Cluentius we also discover what corruption and what monsters Roman society presented. In one small municipality on the Adriatic we see divorcees, incests, forgeries, poisonings, judges corrupted, a mother maddened against her sons, etc., etc., etc. See also Lord Mackenzie, *Rom. L.*, p. 345. *Ambitus.*

for the people¹ and religion.² There were also all the debris of Epicureanism, who had passed among pleasures and dangers³ the last storms of the Republic and were now reposing under the shadow of despotism amid the delights of an effeminate life, away from the fatigues of the life militant. The type of the Epicureans of good society was Mécenas, that servant of Augustus Macenas, who wrote scented and pretentious books about the toilette and made a show of the luxury of women by appearing in public in the folds of a trailing robe, escorted by two eunuchs better men than himself! Unhappy being, tired of his comforts, seeking in the cup, in concerts, in the roar of cascades, and in divorces⁴ a thousand times repeated, the means of awakening his blunted sensibilities.⁵

It was in that elegant but perverted world, beside the contempt for the gods, that the morality of interest, the worship of selfishness, and the intoxication of sensuality reigned. Augustus intended to draw from that source, as we shall presently see, the principles of his body of laws for the regeneration of Italy. He governed his epoch by the motives which regulated its activity. But vicious principles cannot beget blessings. Corruption advanced instead of being retarded, and ended in the abominable excesses depicted by Tacitus, by the reign of Messalina,⁶ the infamy of Nero⁷ and the fetes of Tigellinus.⁸

¹ Mont. *Grand. et Decad.*, ch. x. Cicero *ad. Attic.* iv.18, *loc. cit.* ² Id.

³ See in Suetonius the supper of Octavius (*Oct. Aug.* 70). Such were the indecent pleasures of the men of that epoch of moral and political disorder.

⁴ Owing to his repeated quarrels with and divorces from his wife *Terentia*.

⁵ Seneca has drawn this portrait with a master hand. *Epist.* 114 and *de Provid.* 3.

⁶ The corruption of the Roman world has been admirably depicted by M. Villemain in his *Mélanges* t. iii, p. 201 et seq.

⁷ *Annal.* xi, 26—37; xiii, 19—32, where the historian gives an account of the most frightful corruptions, as illustrative of the principle that in human affairs nothing is so vain and transitory as that fancied pre-eminence which depends upon public opinion without any solid foundation to support it.

⁸ *Annal.* xiii, 13—16; xiv, 1—3 et seq. xvi, 4-5; *Hist.* I., 16; See also

Stoicism, the only depository of purer doctrines emerged from time to time from its discouragement, exhibiting qualities forcibly delineated. The majority of generous spirits had taken refuge there as in a citadel, built up against the decadence of men and things. Some, whom a disgust for business drew away from the Senate, there sought to fortify the mind by the study of wisdom, while others, whose vocation called them to the dangers of public duty, there learned to be better than the laws and manners of their age and obtained thence the means for personal improvement. Doubtless Stoicism had also its unworthy and false apostles; doubtless the Epicurean doctrines did not produce in every mind their final and fatal consequences;¹ but I am pointing out the general tendencies and those of Stoicism were as progressive at the epoch with which I am occupied as those of sensualism were suitable to hasten the decline of civilization.

When Christianity invaded the Occident Seneca was the most illustrious representative of Stoicism among philosophers. I have nothing to say of the preceptor of Nero. I only see his writings, through which I do not seek to discover the feebleness of the courtier. Now, those writings are admirable² and their influence

II, 85, as to the lewdness of the Roman women, without distinction of rank. Nero engaged four hundred senators and six hundred Roman knights of fortune and character to encounter wild beasts as gladiators, and women of illustrious rank descended into the arena, and by exhibiting their persons in the lists brought disgrace on themselves and their families. *Sueton in Nero* S. 12; *Tacit. Annal.*, xv., 85. Juvenal says :

Componunt ipsæ per se formantque libellos
Principium atque locos Celso dictare paratæ.

Satire vi, v. 245.

See also Satire viii, v. 191—194. *Tacit. Annal.* xv, 37.

¹ Many good critics think that Virgil, one of the purest men of Italy, was an Epicurean. He had been, in fact, a disciple of Scyros, of the school of Epicurus.—*Cicero Acad.* ii, 33. In his eulogy on Silenus, Virgil presents the theory of creation, developed by Lucretius. Nevertheless, we find in the Sixth Book of his *Aeneid* a certain reflection of Plato. See also Horace. Satire v, 40.

² Villemain has drawn a fine portrait of Seneca. *Melanges* t. iii, p. 235.

was great upon the ulterior destinies of the Stoic philosophy; they are especially distinguished for a considerable improvement upon the works in which Cicero had treated the same subjects.

Seneca was nearly sixty years of age when St. Paul, having dared to appeal to the Emperor from the judgment of Porcius Festus, brought to Rome his philosophy so intensely spiritual. It is said that the great Apostle, whose preaching had shaken Agrippa, Berenice and the proconsul Sergius,¹ preached freely in that city during two entire² years, and there underwent a trial in which he defended himself.³ Can we believe that the novelty of that teaching and the report of that trial could have remained unknown to Seneca whose spirit was feasting incessantly upon the grandest philosophic and social questions? Seneca, moreover, must have known St. Paul by reputation even before the arrival of the latter at the capital of the Roman Empire; for Gallio, his elder brother, found himself interested during his proconsulate at Achaia, in the quarrels of the Jews of Corinth with St. Paul; it was before his tribunal that the enemies of that apostle had brought him as guilty of new superstitions, and Gallio without even wishing to hear his defence had sent him away absolved⁴, with a moderation and spirit of tolerance which justified the eulogies for sagacity which it pleased Seneca to bestow upon him. The intimacy of the brothers was very great. It is to Gallio that Seneca has dedi-

We present one of his opinions of that philosopher whom he, nevertheless, judges with severity. "Some of his ideas of the dignity of man are so exalted, and he acknowledges so eloquently the divine nature of the virtuous soul, that we are tempted to place him among the sages, whose moral enthusiasm prepared the world for the sublime lessons of the Gospel."

Next to the Gospel itself, says L'Estrange, I look upon the works of Seneca as the most sovereign remedy against the miseries of human nature. "Live among men," says Seneca, "as if the eye of God was upon you; and so address yourself to God, as if men heard your prayer." Epist. x.

¹Acts, xxvi, 26—30. ²Acts, xxviii, 30—31. ³II. Timoth., iv, 16.

⁴Acts, xviii, 14.

cated his treatise on *Anger*¹ as well as that on the *Happy Life*, and he often speaks of him in his other works with the most lively testimonials of friendship and consideration.² How, then, is it supposable that Gallio would have left his brother in ignorance of that remarkable incident in his administration, inasmuch as suspicious spirits already connected the prophecies of St. Paul with certain attempts at insurrection which had burst forth in the Orient.⁴ Besides, it is certain that Christianity, at its dawn, had extended its rays even to Rome and anticipated the voyage of St. Paul;⁵ for, in his Epistle to the Romans, that apostle salutes a number of Christians by name and praises them for their faith, already known throughout the world,⁶ and at the time of his landing at Pozzuoli and upon the route between that city and Rome several brethren came to receive him.⁷ During his sojourn in the

¹ He then called himself Novatus—later he took the name of Junius Gallio. ² *De vitâ beata* I. ³ *Consol. ad Helvetiam* 16; *Epist.* 104; see also the Seneca of M. du Rozoir t. I, p. iv, in the preface to the treatise *de Irâ*.

⁴ Acts, xxi, 38; xxii, 24. Josephus *Antiq.*, xv; *de bello jud.*, II.

⁵ Romans, I, i, 8. Acts, xxviii, 15. ⁶ Acts, xvi. Acts, i, 8.

⁷ Acts, xxviii, 15.—The testimony of Tacitus is especially remarkable on account of its hostility. He begins by calumniating the Christians, "A race of men detested for their evil practices, by vulgar appellation commonly called Christians, a name derived from Christ, who in the reign of Tiberius suffered under Pontius Pilate, the procurator of Judea. By that event the sect of which he was the founder received a blow which for a time checked the growth of a dangerous superstition; but it revived soon after and spread with renewed vigor not only in Judea, the country that gave it birth, but even in the city of Rome, the common sink into which everything infamous and abominable flows. Nero proceeded with his usual artifice. He found a set of profligate wretches who were induced to confess themselves guilty and on whose testimony a number of Christians were convicted, not indeed upon clear proof of having set the city on fire, but rather on account of their hatred for the whole human race."—*Annal.*, xv, 44. This was written by Tacitus at the time of the persecution for the burning of Rome under Nero. That conflagration, the work of Nero himself, took place in the sixty-fourth year of the Christian era, or two or three years after the voyage of Saint Paul. We

Eternal City Paul did not cease to write,¹ to hold conferences and to convert²; and his word penetrated even the Palace of the Emperor and there found faithful brethren.³ Thus, then, the evangelic truth had taken root in the capital of the world; it was there by the side of Seneca, raising its serene face above the calumnies which were only a prelude to persecutions and punishments of the most refined atrocity,⁴ and which became a means of causing Christianity to be known and of attracting to it both interest and sympathy.⁵ The truth has a secret power of disclosing and diffusing itself; it takes possession of the understanding in an unknown manner and germinates therein like the good seeds which, cast by the winds upon propitious soil, soon become vigorous trees, the mystery of whose growth remains imperceptible. To the attentive reader of Seneca there is in his morality his philosophy and style a reflection of Christian ideas which colors his writings with a new light. I do not attach undue importance to the correspondence which has

notice, by the way, the unpardonable feebleness of Tacitus, who accuses the Christians of hatred towards the whole human race. He ends by avowing "that the punishment was inflicted out of compassion."

¹The Epistles were nearly all written at Rome.

²Acts, xxviii, 21.

³Philip, iv, 22. He sent them the salutations of those who were in the house of Cæsar. After he was beheaded a Roman lady received his body and gave it burial in a garden on the road to Ostia.

⁴Tacitus describes their punishments, which became a source of amusement: "To their sufferings Nero added mockery and derision. Some were covered with the skins of wild beasts and left to be devoured by dogs, others were nailed to crosses, numbers were burnt alive, and many, covered with inflammable matter, were lighted up at the decline of day to serve as torches during the night."—*Annal.* xv, 44.

Seneca was then living, removed from court and threatened by the Emperor. He died the next year.

⁵We presently see, as Tacitus admits, that compassion was excited by these barbarities. The Christians were conscious of it; for Tertullian (*Apolog.* § 50) says somewhat later, "Who could witness the constancy of the Christians under punishment without being struck by and seeking the cause of it? Who is there that seeks the cause thereof without becoming a Christian?"

been produced between him and St. Paul. I consider those letters fictitious; but was not the supposition of such correspondence really founded upon a community of ideas which manifests itself by similarities the most striking?' Seneca has written an excellent work on Providence, which at the time of Cicero had as yet no Roman² name. He speaks of God in the language of a Christian, not only calls Him Father³ but wishes as in the Lord's Prayer that His will be done,⁴ and teaches that He must be revered and loved.⁵ He sees among men a natural kinship⁶ reaching almost to that universal fraternity of the disciples of Christ. With what ardent philanthropy he demands the rights of humanity for the slave sprung with us⁷ from a common origin, physically enthralled

¹ See the Seneca of Panck, vol. vii, p. 551.

² An observation of M. de Maistre, t. ii, p. 161.—edit. of 1836.

³ "For whatever is for our good, our God and Father—*Deus et Pater noster*—hath graciously set before us. *Epist.* 110; Cicero had not as yet said so much, a fact which Seneca himself calls to mind, in *Epist.* 107, where he says, "It is best to endure what we cannot prevent or mend, and without murmuring hold communion with God, by whose providence all things are directed. Accordingly let us receive his commands with earnestness and alacrity. He then refers to Cicero and quotes the beautiful verses from the *Enchiridion* of Epictetus:

Father of heaven and Ruler of the skies!
Lead me where'er you please; without delay
Prompt and alert, thy summons I obey.
With gentle hand Fate leads the willing mind,
But drags along the stubborn and the blind.
Thus more severely shall I feel the load
That presseth lightly on the just and good.

Morell's *Seneca*, p. 290.

⁴ *Epist.* 74. *Placeat homini quidquid deo placeat.* Let whatever has pleased God please men.

⁵ *Epist.* 47. ⁶ *Epist.* 90 and 95; *de Ira* II, 31.

⁷ *Epist.* 47; *ex iisdem seminibus ortum.* *Epist.* 44. Acts, xviii, 28. For we are all his offspring.

but spiritually¹ free! Are not these the words of St. Paul? I claim, then, that Christianity had enveloped Seneca in its atmosphere,² that it had aggrandized in him the power of the Stoic ideas, and that by this forcible writer it had glided secretly into the philosophy of the Porch and modified and purified its spirit and its language. "Epictetus," says M. Villemain, "was not a Christian, but the impress of Christianity was already upon the world."³ Marcus Aurelius, who persecuted the Christians, was

¹ *Errat, si quis existimat servitutem in totum hominem descendere: pars melior ejus excepta est. Corpora obnoxia sunt, et adscripta dominis: mens quidem sui juris. Corpus itaque est quod domino, fortuna tradidit. Hoc enim, hoc vendidit; interior illa pars mancipio, dari non potest.* He errs who thinks that the whole man descends into servitude. His better part is exempt. The body is subjected to the master, but the soul always remains its own master. It is the body only that fortune delivers up to slavery, and which is sold. The soul cannot be enslaved. *De benefic, iii.20.* ² I. Corinth., vii, 22.

³ That opinion disputed in the xvii century is now supported by the highest authority.

First: The entire Primitive Church believed in some connection between St. Paul and Seneca. The fathers of the Church even called him *Seneca, noster*, our Seneca. St. Jerome *de script. ecclesie* c. xii. Tertulian *de anima*, c. xx. St. Augustine, *de civitate Dei*, lib. vi, c. x.

Second: Would his correspondence with St. Paul, although apocryphal, be of no value as a myth?

Third: The similarity between his ideas and those of the Acts of the Apostles and the writings of St. Paul is striking. Critics have noticed this. See the Seneca of M. du Rozoir in the collection of Panck. t. vii, p. 551.

Fourth: His style contains some biblical expressions, *caro angelus*, which he uses in the same sense as the Gospel and not with the classic signification. M. Du Rozoir *loc. cit.*

Fifth: The best critics admit to-day an exchange of ideas between St. Paul and Seneca. M. Schœll. *Histoire abrégée de la Lit. Rom.* t. 2, p. 448; M. du Rozoir, *loc. cit.*

See also M. de Maistre—*Soirees de S. Petersburg*, t. ii, p. 167, edition of 1836. And a dissertation by Gelpke entitled *Tractatiuncula de familiaritate quæ Paulo apostolo cum Seneca philosopho intercessisse traditur verisimillima.* Leips., 1813. **Melanges* t. iii, p. 279.

more a Christian than he who did not believe in his sublime meditations. Ulpian, the jurisconsult who caused them to be crucified,¹ spoke their language while believing that he was using that of Stoicism in several of his philosophic maxims.² Mark also the progress which ideas had made since Plato and Aristotle with reference to one of the most momentous questions of the ancient world—that of slavery: “If,” says Plato, “a citizen kill his slave the law declares the murderer exempt from punishment if he purify himself by expiation; but if a slave kill his master he is subjected to such punishment as may be thought proper provided his life be not spared.”³

Aristotle went still farther, if it be possible, in his theory of slavery. “There is,” says he, “but little difference between the services that man obtains from the slave and from the animal. Nature herself ordains it, since she makes the body of the freeman different from that of the slave, giving to the one the strength suitable to his destiny and to the other a stature erect and tall.” The illustrious philosopher then concludes as follows: “It is evident, therefore, that slavery for the slave is as natural as freedom for the free, and as useful as it is just.”⁴ Slavery, therefore, finds its legitimacy both in justice and nature.” Such is the doctrine which Aristotle advances without an objection. That doctrine had lost none of its rigor in the time of Cicero.⁵ We know with what cold indifference the Roman orator speaks of the

¹ See his life in Pothier *Pandect.* preface p. xxxix.

² L. 4. D. *de just. et jur.* l. 32 *de regulis juris.*

³ So, also, if a slave kill a freeman not his master the owner was compelled to give him up to the relatives of the deceased, who were under obligations to put him to death in any manner they might choose. *De legibus*, bk. ix. Jowett's translation, p. 379. See also the translation of M. Cousin, t. ii, p. 174—180.

⁴ *Politie*, bk. i, chap. v. See the beautiful translation of M. B. Saint-Hilaire t. i, p. 27, 31; the observations of M. Cousin, *Lois de Platon*, argument, p. 86, 87; and his *Cours d'histoire de la philosophie*, t. i, p. 277. Lesson seventh, 1829. Bodin *La Republique*, liv. i, ch. v., p. 35. See also Jowett's translation, p. 379.

⁵ In his *Offices* he says: *Iis qui vi oppressos imperio coercent est sane*

prætor Domitius, who caused a poor slave to be pitilessly crucified for having slain with a spear an enormous boar.¹ But when we reach the juriconsults who flourished after the Christian Era and Seneca, the language of the philosophy of the law is very different. "Slavery," says Florentinus, "is an institution of the law of any people whereby any one is subjected to the dominion of another contrary to nature"—*contra naturam*.² "Nature has established among men a certain kinship," says the same juriconsult; *inter nos cognationem quondam natura constituit*.³ These words are borrowed from Seneca, and, we may say, henceforth, with the Fathers of the Primitive Church, "*Seneca noster*." Ulpian also says: "In that which concerns the natural law all men are equal." *Quia quod ad jus naturale attinet omnes homines equales sunt*.⁴ And again: "By the natural law all men are born free." *Jure naturali omnes liberi nascerentur*.⁵ It is therefore no longer nature that makes slaves; the theory of Aristotle has had its day.

The philosophy of the law is, therefore, in possession of the great principles of equality and liberty, which constitute the basis of Christianity; it protests in the name of nature against the most terrible of social inequalities and echoes the maxims of the Gospel.

And do not think that these ideas will remain unoccupied in the domain of mere theory. No! We shall soon observe the ameliorations which the condition of the slave drew from them, even before the reign of Constantine, and beginning at the epoch at which Christianity extended itself over the Occident.

adhibenda severitia ut heris in famulos, lib. ii, 7. Cruelty must be employed by those who keep others in subjection by force; as a master towards his slaves if they cannot otherwise be controlled. See also lib. iii, 23. Some questions of ancient morality in regard to slaves.

¹ In Verrem, v. 3. In regard to the act of Domitian in inflicting so cruel a punishment Cicero merely says: I do not pretend to condemn or justify the act; all that I perceive there is that Domitian preferred to appear cruel in punishing than too easy by pardoning that infraction of the law. *Durum hoc fortasse videatur; neque ego ullam in partem disputo: tantum intelligo, maluisse Domitium crudelem in animadvertendo, quam in prætermittendo dissolutum videri.*

² L. 4, § 1, D. *de statu hominis*. ³ L. 3, D. *de just. et jure*.

⁴ L. 32, D. *de reg. juris*. ⁵ L. 4, D. *de just. et jure*.

Certainly such a collision between philosophy and Christianity could not have been fortuitous; we should be compelled to do violence to all the probabilities by attributing to a purely spontaneous elaboration of the former, to a simple progress of its maturity, principles so new to it.¹ Those grand truths, which we admire in Florentinus and Ulpian, Christianity professed for a century and a half openly, boldly, and at the cost of blood and martyrs, and the marvel is that, by the very charm of their attractiveness, those truths had not penetrated the circles politically hostile to them.

Moreover the number of Christians began to be imposing. Pliny, the younger, Governor of Bithynia during the reign of Trajan, from A. D. 98 to 117, complains that the new religion was propagating itself in the country and among persons of every age, sex and condition; that the temples were nearly abandoned, and the sacrifices interrupted.²

Some years later the Christians were in the Senate; they replenished the legions and secured victories to the State, thereby forcing the Emperor to a recognition.³

The confidence⁴ of the faithful having been strengthened by their numbers they believed that they could defend themselves not only by their virtues but by their writings. Apologies were published under Adrian and addressed to the Emperor himself.

¹ M. Villemain has also noticed this new character of Stoicism. *Mélanges* t. iii, p. 279.

² Epist. lib. x, 97—98. Tertull, *Apolog.*, c. 5; Gibbon, chap. xvi. We quote the words of Pliny: *Furent alii similis amentiae, cives Romani—multitudinem omnis ætatis omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam vocantur in periculum et vocabantur.*

³ The legion Fulminantus, composed of Christians, won the victory of Marcus Aurelius over the Quates. Tertullian, *Apolog.* § 5, and Eusebius, lib. v, c. v. Gibbon, chap. xvi.

⁴ M. Villemain—loc. cit. p. 285—has also insisted upon this number of Christians. We cannot doubt that at that epoch, under the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the Christians were very numerous in the empire. Nearly the whole of Greece believed that it had escaped from the Roman power by separating itself from the gods of Rome and that, by adopting a new

Among them were those of Quadratus,¹ Bishop of Athens, and of Aristides, Platonic philosopher. They multiply under his successors and emanate from the hands of the eloquent, learned and illustrious. In that polemics shone St. Justinus, educated in the Platonic² doctrines; Athenagoras, philosopher, of Athens, who adopted the title of Christian³ philosopher; St. Melito, Bishop of Sardis; Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch; Appolinarius, Bishop of Hieropolis; Tatien, disciple of St. Justinus; St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons; Apollonius, Roman Senator, who delivered before a full Senate a defence of his faith; St. Clement, of Alexandria, disciple of Pantenus¹⁰; and, finally, Tertullian, born a Pagan but converted to Christianity, and so captivating by the vehement severity of his style and the strength of his reasoning.¹¹ Is it to be believed that those burning words, vindicated by the martyr, would remain fruitless; that the echoes of thought would not be heard by a rival philosophy; that such protestations coming at once from Greece, Syria, Africa, Southern Gaul, from the very heart of Rome itself and from the first assembly of the nation, would stop at the door of Stoicism; protestations which could soften in an instant the severity of the edicts and that, by an imperceptible

religion, it secured the independence which it had lost by the conquest. A portion of Italy and all of Southern Gaul adopted the same religion.

¹ Eusebius Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. c. iii.

² A. D. 150 under the Antonines. His apology is addressed to the Emperor, the Senate and the Roman people. "You can take our lives," says the orator, "but you cannot compel us to do wrong." M. Villemain has shown a worthy appreciation of that fine apology. T. iii, p. 287 of his *Melanges*.

³ In the year 166 he addressed Marcus Aurelius. M. Villemain admires this morsel of Christian philosophy where reign benevolence and the loveliest sentiments of virtue. *Melanges*, T. iii. p. 289.

⁴ A. D. 170 under Marcus Aurelius. ⁵ 171 do. ⁶ 172 do. ⁷ 180 do.

⁸ 179 do. ⁹ 189 under Commodus.

¹⁰ A. D. 194 under Severus. See Gibbon, chap. xvi.

¹¹ The testimony of Cyprian is cited by Gibbon to show the authority of Tertullian among the Christians of the Occident. Hieronym. *de Viris Illustribus* t. i, p. 284.

mingling therewith, such protestations would not open a broader career to the metaphysical sciences and morality ?

Already, during the intervals in which persecutions were suspended Christianity approached still nearer to the imperial throne. Septimus Severus had confided to Proculus, a Christian, the education of his eldest son.¹ Alexander Severus, whose mother was almost Christian, worshipped Christ by the side of Abraham and Orpheus,² and ceaselessly uttered those evangelic words, "Do not unto others that which you would not have them do unto you," words which he caused to be graven upon the walls of the public buildings.'

Z. HAZARD POTTER.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

¹ Caracalla. Tertullian says : *Lacte christiano educatus. Ad Scapulam*, chap. iv. The nurse as well as the preceptor of Caracalla were Christians. —Gibbons, chap. xvi.

Lamp. in vita Alex. Sever. Christo templum facere voluit, eumque inter deos recipere, xliii, and again : In larario suo, divos principes, sed optimos electos, et animas sanctiores, in quis et Apollonium, et quantum scriptor temporum suorum dicit, *Christum*, Abraham, et Orpheum et hujuscemodi ceteros habebat. xxix. Gibbon, chap. xvi.

² Lamp. Li. Et in palatio et in publicis operibus prescribi juberet.

THE MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION.

Reconciliation implies two parties and an alienation between them. The parties intended by the Apostle to whom we are indebted for these words are doubtless man on the one hand and God the Creator, Moral Governor and Final Judge of men, on the other. For one who is willing to take the Bible for a guide and be satisfied with it there is to be found on its pages a sufficient proof and explanation of the fact. It tells us of man's early condition, his primeval innocence, of his fall, of his sinfulness and misery as a consequence of the fall. From beginning to end that Holy Volume is occupied with the account of man's alienation from God and of God's efforts at a reconciliation. For this Revelation and Miracles; for this Prophets and Apostles; for this the Incarnation and the death on Calvary; for this the gift of tongues and the outpouring of the Spirit; for this the whole line of preachers and martyrs; for this the constant strivings of the Spirit and the occasional conversion of here and there one whose heart its Lord hath touched that he might receive the blessed tidings of salvation.

If, however, one is not satisfied with this line of testimony, or if for the greater confirmation of his faith he wishes to look in another direction he has only to turn to the study of history and to the experience of his own life. In these ages men are anxious to see in order that they may believe—and many there are who will not believe unless they can see—they invert the Apostle's precept and prefer to walk by sight rather than by faith. Such persons we invite to a study of human history, whether it be that which is exhibited in the pages of the learned writers or that which is written in the experience of their own hearts.

Whatever may be our theory as to the origin and primitive condition of man we cannot doubt that all through the historic period he has been far below the ideal of his nature. He has always

been ignorant of many things he should have known. He has been in error when truth was most important to right action. He has been wilful, perverse, doing what he knew to be wrong, or wanting in the energy and self-control necessary to do right.

Now no one who believes in a God of truth and righteousness can hesitate to admit that here is a want of harmony between man and his Creator. On the one side we have truth, wisdom, omniscience, and on the other ignorance, error and superstition. On the one side we have perfect righteousness. On the other, perversity, self-indulgence, impurity and malice. The parties are unlike and alien the one from the other. They do not harmonize or agree in thought or purpose or action. Perhaps the alienation does not imply enmity or hostile feelings and intentions the one towards the other. It may not lead to any intention to do wrong or injury the one to the other. But they are diverse, unlike, alien, the one from the other.

And herein is the source of man's misery; for God is right and righteous altogether. His will is law. He rules in this world and executes here as He will execute hereafter righteous judgment. Hence if man at all times knew the will and truth of God he would be able to strive at least to live according to this will and truth. And if he should succeed in living according to it he would be no longer a transgressor, no longer unrighteous in any of his ways, and the fruits and results of transgression and unrighteousness would no longer appear in the form of disease, disappointment and misery. Let some "Ministry of Reconciliation" interpose and make men wise and holy even as God is holy and wise—man in his lower measure and according to his capacity even as God in His infinite capacity is wise and holy, and man would be raised from all his sin and degradation to purity, holiness and happiness. We should have more and better than was lost in Eden, more and better here and now in our daily lives and in our domestic homes than ever poet or philosopher dreamed of.

And is not this the hope and aspiration of all men? The Christian missionary proclaims it as his inspiration and motive when he leaves home and all its endearments to go and preach the gospel to the heathen; the martyr proclaims it when he rejoices in the opportunity to suffer for Christ's sake; the

newly ordained deacon, the young man full of hope and life and with brightest prospects for worldly honor and success—these all and alike proclaim the hope and aim when they give up all that the world can promise, and count it but filth and rubbish that they may devote themselves to the work of “the ministry of reconciliation.”

And so too the statesman, the physician, the philanthropist, the man of genius, though possibly making no profession of Christianity and perhaps quite ignorant of or scorning the help of this best helper, do nevertheless proclaim the same purpose and are animated by the same hope, the purpose and aim and hope of discovering and making known the truth, persuading men to accept it in order that they may become wiser, better and happier. Even the boldest materialist who believes or professes to believe in nothing but matter, has no hope or faith in anything but that which now is and the eye can see, does nevertheless profess to be a seeker after truth and claims credit for a show of benevolence in striving to bring men to accept his views, because he believes those views will make them wiser and better and happier than they now are.

Of course we think their mistake is a fatal one. When they affirm facts and laws of this material world they may be right, and what they teach may be very useful. But when they deny the reality of things spiritual we think they are in error. But whatever they do in the way of discovery and setting forth fact or law they do—however unconsciously and however unintentionally—some work in the way of reconciliation between man and God, they bring us to think more nearly in accordance with His truth, to act more in harmony with His law. This we must admit, though we may be constrained to confess that in some cases they do more harm than good in other respects by leading them who accept their theories farther from the truths that it is most necessary for them to know.

But the Christian man who undertakes in any sphere to make men wiser and better is working in “the ministry of reconciliation.” He may be teaching the laws of health by which we may obey God and avoid the diseases that come from violation of His laws. He may be teaching us the facts of science whereby we shall

be able more effectually to cultivate the earth and subdue it and all that is in it to our use. He may be trying to improve the laws, correct errors in the national policy, so that the "powers that be" and are "ordained of God" may rule more in harmony with the will of God and work more effectually together with Him in bringing about a reign of righteousness and the establishment of a kingdom of heaven on earth. For man to be perfect he must be whole in body as well as in soul; he must be lord of this lower world and master of its resources as well as of himself. And any help, any work, any progress in this direction is so much done towards the reconciliation of God with man. They who labor in these ways, they also are engaged in "the ministry of reconciliation."

But there is a higher, a more special, work in "the ministry of reconciliation" to which, no doubt, the Apostle especially referred. We read that our Lord when He ascended up on high "gave some apostles and some prophets and some evangelists and some pastors and teachers for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ." We see how intimately all these were associated in the mind of the Apostle—"the work of the ministry," "the ministry of reconciliation," is for the perfection of mankind, making them saints, holy, righteous, and this is the building up of the body of Christ, which is His Church, for the Church is His Body.

We vindicate our claims to have this ministry regarded as a higher sphere in the work of reconciliation for the fact that man's greatest enemy is not his ignorance or his many errors in opinion; the root of the evil lies deeper. It is in the instincts—in the soul. If all men would do as well as they know how the face of the world would be changed at once. Man's great want is doubtless light and truth; but his greatest want is moral strength, the will to do, the courage to dare, the purpose, the fortitude, the enduring determination; the persistence in effort to do as well as he knows how.

And here again we appeal to History, and to personal experience. We need not appeal to the Scriptures—they are full of testimony to the fact that man needs the fear of a personal God who will punish and avenge, as well as the assurance of One who will favor

and assist in order that this knowledge, whatever it may be, shall be of any avail to his salvation. The devils know and believe and tremble; but they do not obey; they do not—perhaps they cannot will to do that which they know to be pleasing to God and conducive to their own welfare. And for them—the lowest of God's creatures, for even they are the creatures of God though in rebellion against him, from these I say up through all the grades of intelligent beings, up to the highest archangel—there is the same necessity, though in different degrees, for a faith in a God who will both punish the wicked and help and strengthen the weak.

And if there is any one thing that history and experience teach, it is that no mere statement or acceptance of the abstract principles of science or of morality is of much avail for the moral improvement of mankind, without that faith in a personal God as a moral governor of the Universe, which will convert these principles of science and morality into a religion; and lead to obedience and worship as well as to knowledge and profession.

Hence not only did our Lord appoint a ministry in diverse orders, but he gathered His followers into a Church which became an organized body; "a royal priesthood," all working together for themselves, for the world, for their own perfection, and the conversion of mankind. They were not left scattered and isolated, each one to do his own work in his own way; but they were organized into a body, having a common life, and all deriving health and strength from the coöperation of one upon another and of all together. In this organization there was a tremendous power to help the weak, to steady the wavering, to restrain the erratic and wayward, to build up the inner life by which they were able to rise above the temptations of the world. And so vastly superior was this as a means of doing good to men that the Apostle, as if forgetting all the rest does not hesitate to call it "*the ministry of reconciliation.*"

And I think we may agree with him. Science and statesmanship will do man no good—they *can* do him no good that is worth the learning, unless there be a faith in God, and an acceptance of Christianity as a revelation of His will. There must be first an individual strength; there must be a renovation of man's moral nature before any information or mere culture of the intellect can do anything more than make him more miserable, and more sensi-

ble of his wretchedness and misery. Mere knowledge is as likely to stimulate and invite to crime, as to restrain one from its commission. Even self-love and that lower baser form of self interest which we call selfishness will not induce men to observe the commonest precepts of health—to say nothing of the far more comprehensive principles of social order and national well-being. Nothing but a conviction that there is an all-seeing God Who knows even the thoughts of the heart, and the inevitable certainty with which He will search out and punish our transgressions, can take hold of the heart with a hand strong enough to raise it up to spiritual life.

But the gospel is not all terror. Men are not all so hardened in their sins that they care not for it. The gospel has a voice of mercy as well as a proclamation of the terrors of the law. For the thousands who feel and bewail this wretchedness it proclaims pardon and brings its help to such. And this is the superiority of the gospel system. It has not only an outward ministry proclaiming the truth and the law, but also an inward spirit working within the hearts of them that will believe, enabling them to do the will of Him whose law they accept. The Holy Ghost works with the ministry, and through them He gives power to the words they speak. He gives the grace that accompanies the Sacraments they administer. He is the inward and indwelling power that regenerates and renovates their natures, giving both the will and the power to do those things that are well-pleasing to God.

I cannot see how persons who know anything of human history or human experience can expect much from our ministry or means of reconciliation that is not accompanied by the coöperating help of a Divine agency. Surely they look only on the surface of things and ascribe to other causes what God is doing in their midst. One would suppose that the mere fact of what has occurred by way of truth and progress since the introduction of Christianity and within the sphere of its operations would be sufficient to satisfy the most sceptical that there is abundant proof of a divine power and agency that is nowhere else at work in this world of ours.

This point is worthy of more illustration from history than the time or the space at our disposal will allow. We have all heard much of the Buddhist *Nirvana*, and many there are who stoutly

claim that it means annihilation. But mean what it may it is the chief topic of those who believe in Buddhism. And doubtless there are and have been millions who regarded it as a state of insensibility, even if they did not go so far as to entertain the metaphysical conception of annihilation. But it was accepted not because life is not sweet and desirable, not because the instinctive belief in a future life is not innate ineradicable. Its adoption and acceptance teaches a deeper lesson than that.

The Hindoo mind was harrassed and oppressed by two dread nightmares of misbelief. The one was that there is no Saviour, no atoning sacrifice, no helping spirit, no compassion, no help from on high, so that each must work out his own evolution, not as we may do because it is God that worketh within us both to will and to do His good pleasure, but because there is no Divine help or aid anywhere. The other great nightmare of oppression was the doctrine of transmigration. He that did not or could not by his own efforts raise himself in this world above the moral and spiritual level at which he entered it at his birth must go at death into a body of some lower and more degraded form of life, even to descend from low to lower stages unless in some one of these he could of himself and without other aid than his own faculties make a turn and begin to ascend and become better, regenerating and renovating his own nature with a hope of attaining purity and power after many ages, possibly centuries of persevering and successful effort, if during all that while there should be no relaxation of effort, no mistake or error in judgment as to the means to take and the act to be performed.

To the great mass of the Hindoos, Mongolians and Chinese as well, especially the lower classes, immersed in ignorance, poverty and all the varied wretchedness of this life, enfeebled by a debilitating climate and discouraged by the recollection of a long and wretched past, this idea of an insensibility, where there could be no suffering, not even hopelessness and despair, seemed welcome and preferable to such a hope or hopelessness as either of the prevailing religions could offer. Heaven and rest and blissful enjoyment only on condition of no evil acts or evil thoughts here and for ages to come was poor encouragement. And with this the risk for all, which must inevitably become the certainty for many, of a

future unspeakably worse and more devoid of hope than the present, made the acceptance of *Nirvana*, insensibility, possibly annihilation. An eternal sleep was preferable to even the risk of anything worse than the present. And so they were content to relinquish hope to escape the certainty of endless despair. Oh! to me this is the saddest picture in all human history, the deepest tragedy ever enacted on this earth. Millions on millions of human beings so oppressed with a sense of sin and misery and so without hope or sympathy or encouragement from on high that they renounce all hope except that of annihilation, the oblivion of eternal sleep, while they live on and endure as they are. No wonder suicide is prevalent. No wonder a death-like stagnation settles down on all intellectual life, all progress, and man becomes the slave of the circumstances that surround him.

In contrast with this consider the Christian's hope. The case is bad, bad beyond comprehension undoubtedly. And the more he knows of himself and the more he comprehends the gospel the more thoroughly does he appreciate the evil that sin has done in this world and in his own heart. But with this there is hope. There is a faith in an Omnipotent and all-loving Father, there is belief in a Saviour, one mighty to save, there is assurance of a Holy Spirit that works and will work within us, reviving the heart, strengthening every weakness, making triumph and Heaven finally sure to all—to all, that is, who will accept and use the means provided and the terms offered by the Father of Mercy.

From this point of view what I have said of men of science working in "the ministry of reconciliation," although doubtless true, seems hardly worth saying. Nay, it seems almost a pity to have said it; it seems almost like a belittling of the grand subject of the Sacred Ministry of the Church to concede anything to any other agency, even to speak of any other as in any way belonging to the same category and desiring to be called by the same name or even to be spoken of in the same connection.

And yet I am not disposed to take back one word I have said on that subject nor to bate one jot or tittle of the credit I have ascribed to those who work in these views of duty. Nay, I am rather disposed to add to it. I think it one of the mistakes, one of the misfortunes of our age, that we do not sufficiently recognize

and acknowledge our indebtedness to these co-workers in this "ministry of reconciliation." We have the word divided which God hath most certainly joined together. We not only speak of science and religion as two—and that they are—but have men who speak of them as antagonists and rivals, men who claiming to be friends of religion write of the "conflict between them," "the warfare" of the one against the other. There is something very bad, something far in the wrong in the sentiments of the community where such things could be said. There is no "conflict" or "warfare" between them. Scientists may dispute with theologians as scientists and theologians and politicians too may dispute with each other, get angry at, abuse, and denounce, and say all manner of evil of each other, but science and religion are at no warfare or conflict. This may have been in ages past and there may be now theologians and ecclesiastics, as there are statesmen and politicians who would if they could suppress all thought that they cannot control. But do not let us ascribe these infirmities and weaknesses of men to the able subjects they have espoused. Science and Religion *are* in harmony; friends, sisters, mutual helpers, both instruments and means by which God would bring about a reconciliation between His ignorant, erring, sinful children and himself. A sound mind in a sound body—this is the end and aim of God. And how much soever the workers in either department may be ignorant of the true nature of their work, of their relation to one another and the final end which their labors are to accomplish, we know that God overrules them all and will work out by them that which He has ordained from the beginning, even before the foundation of the world.

But nothing of this must be understood as belittling the work of the ministry in the Ministry in the narrow sense of the word or as derogating ought from its dignity and importance. It is after all *the* work of the ministry of reconciliation between God and man, and this, because of the fact already stated that man's deepest want is in his spiritual nature. His sorest need is not science or knowledge, but moral strength and righteousness of purpose.

The word *ministry* has two significations. By the one it denotes the work to be done; by the other the agents or agency by which it is to be done. Hence a "ministry of reconciliation" as well

as a ministration of reconciliation; a ministry to do the work of ministration.

To my mind such a ministry is as about as necessary to the work of reconciliation as the Gospel itself. It is not preaching only or chiefly as we all very well know that is chiefly instrumental in edifying the Body of Christ. It is rather the work of the pastor than the word of the preacher that accomplishes, though slowly perhaps yet surely the work of edifying the church. And this work takes time and study, and prayer, as well as patience and perseverance, and forbearance, and about any other virtue that human nature possesses or can be made capable of. Hence the necessity of training and preparing men for the work; the necessity for orders; not only that they may have authority to speak in Christ's name, but also that they may have the grace and the gifts for this work.

Doubtless every word and every act by which men are made wiser or better is a ministry of reconciliation. It makes them more like God; more at one with Him. But their words and their acts will be comparatively few without faith in God and the sanctification of the heart which His spirit worketh in us. And the Apostle's question comes to us with increased force, "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach unless they are sent?" Sent of God and of man; of God that they may speak with wisdom and with power; sent of man that there may be to all the churches and throughout all the world this evidence that they are of the ministry of reconciliation. The age of miracles is passed; the testimony of the spirit is often mistaken; but the LORD is in His church, and works now that He has ascended up on high and gives these gifts of Bishops and Pastors unto men through His Church as the keeper and witness of His word, the pillar and ground of the truth. Hence when we ordain for the Ministry, we are especially doing the work of the "ministry of reconciliation." We are sending forth men to teach the nations that God is the Father of all; that Christ the Redeemer is the Brother of all; and when we persuade men to receive these doctrines we move them by all their gratitude for creation and redemption; by all their sense of the blessings they enjoy here or hope for here-

after, to do good to their fellow-men, and become helpers also in this work of reconciliation. Hence ours is preëminently the ministry of reconciliation. We do the first great work ourselves in conducting men to the knowledge of God and the wisdom of the just, and then through these we do also indirectly the other work which they do in turning men from their evil ways, and raising them from ignorance, error and ungodliness of whatever form and of all forms, to that likeness of God in which man was at first created.

I see not how any one who understands history or human nature can fail to see how a Church and a Ministry are not as necessary as a Gospel and a Saviour; or how the one must not be as divine and as sacred as the other. If Christ was needed to begin the work of the ministry of reconciliation, surely a Church and a Ministry are needed to carry it on to its accomplishment. So necessary is it that this work and this ministry seem to be the one thing above all others that deserves to be called the "ministry of reconciliation," the one thing above all others which men ought to do and make sure of having done. Without it men may live well enough for this world; but without it, they cannot live at all in the world to come.

Hence we must regard the Church, and, foremost in the Church the Ministry, as God's agency for carrying on the great work of human progress. It may be, and possibly it is now, the case that we have too much concentrated one thought on Christianity as a means of saving men's souls from God's wrath in the world to come. A means to do this end it is undoubtedly and as such it is worthy of all attention, acceptance and support. But it saves them in the world to come by making them God-like in this; wise, pure, holy, good, and doing good to all men here. The religion that does not make men observant of God's laws here, can benefit them but very little hereafter. Mere sentiment or emotion unless it leads to righteousness in act and in life, is but a worthless, nay even a debasing luxury. It makes men worse rather than better. It demoralizes, enfeebles and eats out the very life of all that constitutes the nobleness of our nature, and makes man worthy of efforts at his salvation. Give me rather the hardened villain than the effeminate dilettanti as the subject for missionary enterprise.

The man who is content with mere emotion—or who lives merely to please himself is strongly tempted to abandon the institutions God has appointed for His work of regeneration, and should look well to it and see if he be not actuated by another spirit than that which was poured out by the Lord Himself on the Apostles and early disciples. God has for the most part more meaning and a deeper purpose in even the least of His commandments or the most insignificant of His institutions than we are apt to be aware of. Hence we adhere to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, to the rites of Confirmation and Ordination, to the three-fold ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. Hence we sacrifice personal preference to established order, yield private opinion to the authorized declarations of faith, and are willing to give up anything but the truth itself for the unity, the harmony, and the peace of the Church. And this we do and are ready to do "willingly and of a good mind," not because we know them to be *essential* or can prove them to be indispensable to salvation, but because we regard a devout and obedient spirit a spirit of self-sacrifice and of forbearance with the weakness of nature, as among the crowning glories of the Christian character; and because we believe God is apt to have more meaning in even His most insignificant acts and directions than we know of or can now comprehend. There is no danger of being too obedient; there is danger of being too disobedient.

I cannot see how any one can read history or study human nature without being thoroughly convinced that the Church is especially the "ministry of reconciliation." The divine institution of a Church is as much a part of natural religion as any other. Hence I go to a Bible expecting to find there an account of such an institution, its organization and orders, its function and duties. I do not need to be convinced of something that is contrary to my expectations and preconceived notions. With my knowledge of man and of society—of a history of the past and the way things are *done* now—I do not see how God could regenerate man more by society without *organizing a society to do it*. Man attempts nothing without organization. We not only organize the states, but we have organized societies for about anything man undertakes good or bad. And are not we to expect that God would take advantage

of this trait of human nature? Are we to expect that He would introduce a means of salvation and not organize a band of workers to carry it on? to originate a ministry of reconciliation and not provide for ministers to do its work? to have His sheep scattered and a prey to wolves, and not gather them into a fold with shepherds and pastors to take charge of them? to regenerate and bring into existence by a new birth children and thus make no provisions for their care and nurture? Is it to be expected that in the great work that is to be done in this world, He who planted in us our social instincts, our yearnings for sympathy and companionship would not take advantage of these things as means to do His work? Why? The Jewish and Christian religions are not so much better than others that have been taught in this world that we can account for the prevalence and blessed purity of this on the mere score of their superiority in their doctrines and their ethical teachings. The great superiority of Christianity besides the fact of Atonement and Divine help is the fact that its Founder *did* organize His disciples into a body. One body—a mystical body—with a unity of life, and hope and aim; that in short he *did* found a Church. And from that day to this His Church—the visible organized body what has been known by that name is as surely and as truly His means for carrying on and accomplishing the work of reconciliation as the sun and the showers are the means of producing the verdure of spring, the bloom and beauty of summer, or the fruitage of autumn. A gospel without a Church, one as divine and as sacred as the other would be but a work half begun; begun never to be continued, carried on, or completed; begun—to fail as soon as begun.

Such is human nature, and such would have been the result of merely preaching the Gospel and founding no Church. And such would be the result now if we abandon a foundation once laid, and the historic continuity of that which was then begun. Of course we cannot expect the work to go on without the continued presence and coöperation of the Holy Ghost, and the Divine favor. But God works by means. Human sympathy and fellowship are among them. Another, and chief perhaps among them all, is the veneration for the past, the disposition to acquiesce in established order, to abide by what has been long tried and found to be

safe and useful, and satisfactory; the belief in fact that that which long endures is sustained by Divine aid and favor, and is prolonged by God Himself for the work He has for it to do. Hence the disposition to distrust ourselves rather than to suspect the Church, which is never safe, is always quite sure to be wise. What we most of all want is to be guided in the right way. What we but very little and seldom want is to be encouraged in a conceit of our own notions, or the assertion of our particular opinions. The Gospel and the Church, one and inseparable now and forever, the two parts of one undivided and indivisible whole—the "Ministry of Reconciliation."

And yet I fear we are apt to forget that scientific men have a work to do that is especially needful for this age. I speak not of the heathen in foreign lands, but of the misery and the miserable here at home. Something must be done for their earthly welfare. They must be taught the laws and conditions of health. They must be made to understand that licentiousness and drunkenness, and laziness too, are not only morally wrong and religiously intolerable, but also *on scientific grounds* that by the inevitable laws of nature they will bring disease, impoverishment of the blood, derangement of the current of life, with sterility, debility, idiocy, deformity and insanity, with inevitable extinction in the succeeding generations. Darwin's law of "*struggle for life with survival of the fittest*" works with a most tremendous and most irresistible force here. I think the aid of this fact with the help of scientific men to support us in its application should be made effectual. Here is a case where Science and Religion may and should co-operate.

I think, too, that the Political Economist, though a mere man of Science, should do something for us. It is not merely misfortune nor merely the allotment of Providence that we have so many that are wretchedly poor amongst us. The Gospel is not the only thing they need. In this God's earth there is land enough for all to cultivate if we will only let them have it to cultivate. The labor of one half at least can produce enough and more than enough for all to eat and wear and be comfortable. And St. Paul says something which I don't care now to recall, about those that will not work. And I do not remember that he makes any ex-

ception in favor of those who have enough to live upon without work.

I see not how with the gospel in our hands and our surplices on our backs or without either, we are going to be able to satisfy these half-fed, half-clothed and wholly uneducated millions that they who do all the work should not have at least enough to eat; why idleness should prosper; why self-indulgence and lust should be provided for and the instincts for knowledge and virtue should not be provided for. "The laborer is worthy of his hire." So says the gospel and so says science. And science says, too, that "the hire" should be enough to satisfy all the natural wants of food and clothing, of comfort and of virtue. And I think that the Religion of Christ says about the same thing. The two are in accord here. There is neither "conflict, warfare, nor battle-field" between them in this matter.

Let us heed science in these respects. Let us avail ourselves of the share of the work in "the ministry of reconciliation," she has done for us already and is continually doing, and I think we shall find our share vastly easier of accomplishment. Let us obey the laws of nature, let us accept the truths which science has taught us and I think we shall find those to whom we have occasion to preach the truths of the Gospel vastly more ready to hear us and acquiesce in what we have to say. Doubtless the Gospel can do much to make these happy—or what is better—blessed in their misery. But they will be vastly more ready to hear if we alleviate their misery or take measures to do so in the *natural* way first, and before we attempt the *supernatural*. They will care a thousand fold more for "the salvation of their souls" after we have made their lives somewhat more clean, enjoyable and dignified, and themselves satisfied with this care by a life that is worth living, and that they have souls that are worth saving. I think we must do something to correct the wrongs which they see and feel before they can be made to feel very sensible of the wrongs they are doing to themselves and their Maker, by their unbelief and irreligion. It certainly seems inconsistent to preach to them the virtues of saints and angels, while we are participating or acquiescing in wrongs which tend to inspire them with the malignity and the vices of fiends.

No, let rather Science and Religion work together. Let us assent to and do all that science teaches and requires; do this perhaps in a general way first. It is certainly the most obvious and the want for it is the most deeply felt. And yet in a certain other way and respect of the case we should preach the Gospel first. The soul is undoubtedly more than the body, and it can be saved under circumstances where the body can only suffer and perish. No, let the Gospel be first, be midst, and be last. But let Science come also and do her work—both work together, each in its own way, in God's way rather, for there is no way that is good but His, and blessed are they that find it.

W. D. WILSON.

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN BOHEMIA AND MORAVIA.

No. III.

Of twenty-six nobles and knights who, after the battle of Mühlsberg, surrendered unconditionally to the King of Bohemia, ten belonged to the *Unitas Fratrum*. Some of these were deprived of their estates; Kostka von Postupitz lost Leitomischl, and Wolf von Krajek, Brandeis on the Adler. The latter was forbidden to leave Jungbunzlau for the remainder of his life. On St. Bartholomew's Day (twenty-five years before the French Massacre) a Diet, called "the Bloody," opened its sessions with the execution of four of the chief insurgents. One of these, Wenzel von Petipesky, belonged to the Brethren's Church. Since it could not be denied that the Bohemian nobles connected with the *Unitas* had taken a very active part in the revolt the Utraquists availed themselves of the opportunity of laying the blame upon the "Picard" clergy. Bishop Augusta especially was charged with having been in secret correspondence with the Elector of Saxony. Augusta denied the charge, but his adversaries remained unconvinced. Ferdinand, who had long since laid aside all scruples touching his coronation oath, thought the time ripe for enforcing religious uniformity; the Utraquists were to unite with the Roman Catholics, and all other religious persuasions should be suppressed. True, this work could only be accomplished in Bohemia, for Moravia had remained loyal to his standard. But what could be accomplished in the larger kingdom might, he thought, be done without difficulty ere long in the smaller. On the 18th of September, as the king was passing out of church, he was called upon by the Roman and Utraquist clergy to protect them from the oppressions of the Picards. The king, who very probably was himself the instigator of the movement, lent a gracious ear to his petitioners and on the 8th of

October issued a proclamation commanding a rigid enforcement of the Jakobs Mandate of 1508. This mandate prohibited any assembly of the Picards and gave all their church edifices to the Roman Catholics or the Utraquists. This royal decree was submitted to by the defeated nobles without resistance. Even the Lord von Pernstein forbade the assemblage of the Brethren on his domains. Their remonstrance met with no success; all he ventured to promise was that he would use what influence he had with the king in behalf of religious freedom. The Moravian Bishops in their pastorals encouraged their flocks to steadfast endurance, and Augusta forbade any compromise with error. The king about this time being in conference with his brother, the Emperor of Germany, at Augsburg, the Brethren addressed a petition to both, praying for relief from their present deplorable condition. Disavowing for themselves all complicity in the insurrection they asked for the punishment of the guilty and protection of the innocent. At the beginning of the next year their envoy, John Girk, Rector of Leitomischl, received a reply addressed "To those who call themselves the *Unitas Fratrum* in Bohemia and Moravia." It simply admonished them that the king's decree of the 8th of October in the foregoing year was the latest declaration of his will and was to be obeyed throughout the realm.

As the result of this harshness of King Ferdinand toward the Brethren the zeal for persecution waxed warm among the Utraquists and Romanists. Forms of abjuration were drawn up for the use of such Brethren as might be induced to recant. The Roman oath was to this effect:

I, N. N., anathematize from my heart the Picard heresy and promise faith and devotion to the true Church for myself and family before God, His Mother and all His Saints; and if I break this oath I submit to any punishment. So help me God! I believe transubstantiation, the sufficiency of one species, the benefit of the sacraments in the Roman Catholic Church and in that alone, the supremacy of the Pope, the truth of ecclesiastical tradition and the efficacy of absolution and anathema by the Church and the Holy Father.

A similar form, adapted to Utraquist dogma, was presented by the Calixtines, who appear to have been especially zealous against the Brethren. In the beginning of the year 1548 the king issued a still more stringent edict against them. The churches of the Picards wherein false doctrines are disseminated must be closed,

private assemblies are forbidden them, the ministers of their congregations must be sought out and delivered up to the civil authority—the law of King Wladislaw must be fully carried out. This persecution was not entirely the result of religious intolerance; but because the king held the *Unitas* directly responsible for the recent conspiracy.

The chief minister of the king's vengeance was the Royal Captain *Schöneich* of Silesia in *Leitomischl*, of whom it was said that he was "a natural-born Jack Ketch." He waylaid a funeral procession of the Brethren and compelled sixteen heads of families, who had taken part in it, under heavy bonds to appear before the courts in Prag, where they were thrown into the White Tower. Here they were tormented with threats and exhortations to abjure the *Unitas*. When these proved unavailing they were thrust into a deep dungeon of the Tower where the private vaults had their outlet and the intolerable stench rendered life almost insupportable. Their wives came to Prag to see them but were only allowed to converse with them through a hole in the wall. The insupportable stench soon drove them away. Meanwhile the Romish and Utraquist clergy were unceasing in their efforts to effect the conversion of the prisoners and succeeded in winning over six of them. The patience and constancy displayed by the remainder made an impression even on their enemies. A Utraquist priest declared from his pulpit that the words of Christ (John, xvi.2), "They shall put you out of the synagogues; yea, the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service," applied fully to the Brethren; but could not be said either of the Roman Catholics or of the Utraquists who were the persecutors not the sufferers.

Not only were the churches of the Brethren closed but their leaders were arrested. The authorities sent all of their clergy whom they could capture, as prisoners to Prag. Archbishop Augusta, who was at *Leitomischl* when the edict was proclaimed, escaped into the woods about *Reichenau* in the disguise of a peasant. But as the king had offered an especial reward for his capture the crafty Lord von *Schöneich* managed to get him into his power. He sent word to Augusta that a man troubled by the pangs of an uneasy conscience desired to confer with a faithful

pastor, but in a place remote from human dwellings for fear of discovery. Augusta appeared on the 29th of May at the place agreed upon, accompanied by his deacon, Jan Bilek. When he saw Schöneich approaching he cried out in dismay: "My lord, is this honorable dealing?" Schöneich had made the place secure with guards and announced to his prisoner that he was arrested by the king's command both as a mover of sedition and a teacher of false doctrine. Augusta and Bilek were then bound and led away to Prag. One of the Brethren, Wilhelm by name, followed the prisoners to ascertain the place of their confinement, but was discovered and for a long time languished in prison. At Prag Augusta was arraigned on the charges that he had excited his flock to insurrection, traversed the land to raise recruits for the revolt and held secret conferences with the enemy at Wittenberg. Heavy weights were laid upon his feet to compel him to declare what negotiations he had conducted with the Elector of Saxony, where the Brethren had hidden their treasures, and whither they intended to flee if driven from their Fatherland? Augusta replied that he had never meddled with the affairs of State, nor had he been asked to do so; his office was a spiritual one; since the outbreak of the disturbances he had travelled about in the towns and country to admonish his flock to constancy in their faith; at Wittenberg he had more than once visited Luther to confer about the publication of documents; of the treasures of his poor Brethren he knew nothing; as exiles they would find an abode with the Lord of Heaven and earth, who would never forsake His own. It was then announced to him that he would be at once set free if he would abjure his religion and conform to one of those established by law in Bohemia. But this both he and Bilek declared that they would never do. At the time of their arrest Augusta was forty-eight and Bilek thirty-two years of age.

Augusta was then put to the torture. He was bound to a ladder, his thighs covered with warm pitch; then this was set on fire and scraped off along with the skin. Then he was stretched upon the rack, hung upon a hook and covered with heavy weights. The torture ended only when he was half dead. A few hours later he was tortured a second time. Jan Bilek endured similar torments. When it was evident that he was too weak to suffer further tor-

ture, it was announced to him that his wounds would be healed and that then he would be tortured again till he confessed all; even if he had to suffer the infliction ten times. The Archduke had announced to his father the capture of the Bishop and his companion and enquired concerning the method of his treatment. The king gave directions that he should be tortured again in the following manner:

1. Nothing shall be given him to eat or drink for five or six days in succession, while during the same time he shall not be suffered to have a moment's sleep or rest; or,

2. He shall be caused to lie on his back on a hard board, his head hanging down without support, while from time to time some drops of vinegar are poured into his nostrils. This torture shall be continued for a day or two and while he is lying on his back, a living dung-beetle (the larger the better) shall be placed upon his navel and covered with an empty nut shell; or,

3. He shall be fed for some days with dry and highly seasoned food, while not a drop of drink of any sort is allowed to him.

Of these three methods the first two are the most convenient. And if Bilek will not confess, let him be tried by one or another of these methods.

The Royal Chancellor Heinrich von Plauen protested against the application of torture to these unhappy captives and for some reason or other the instructions of the king were not carried out. During this time of sore affliction, Bishop Augusta composed many beautiful hymns, set to melodies the strains of which he heard faintly wafted from neighboring churches.

Not long after, Bishop Augusta with his faithful companion was removed to the ancient fortress of Bürglitz, about twenty-three miles west from Prag. This castle had been used since the time of Charles IV. as a prison for State offenders. It lies so deeply hidden in the forest that Zischka sought for it some days in vain. One of its towers still bears the name of "*Menschenquäler*," i. e., man-tormentor. They were conveyed from Prag during the night under an escort of twenty soldiers, each of the prisoners in a separate carriage. The wounds caused by the burning pitch were running sores and remained untended till they caused an intolerable stench, and the fear arose that they might breed worms. Then a physician was sent for who healed them after seven weeks treatment. Lasitius relates that during their captivity one of their jailers, a Bohemian (the others were Germans who did not understand their language), was so much impressed by their fortitude

and prayers during their sufferings that he cared for them and like the jailor at Thessalonica, was converted and joined the company of the faithful. In order to seduce the constancy of the Bishop his enemies sent beautiful Bohemian girls into his cell and he was visited by the Jesuit Canisius. The latter asked Augusta if the Church had ever erred or could err?—in order to lead him into a friendly discussion. But Augusta compared his question to those put by the Pharisees to Christ, whereupon Canisius withdrew and did not return. The prisoners were confined in a clean elevated dungeon, level with the surface of the earth. All intercourse with them was forbidden, they lay in total darkness and their cells were but poorly warmed. But the food furnished them was sufficient for their nourishment and they were allowed the use of a light during their meals. In this way Augusta spent sixteen, Bilek, thirteen, years of their lives.

Soon after Augusta's arrest his companion at Wittenburg, George Israel, was seized. Israel was born in the year 1504 (some say 1510) at Hunnbrod in Moravia, of a respectable and pious family, and was now the clergyman of Turnau. When the Grand-burggraf von Lobkowitz put him under bonds of a thousand ducats to appear in Prag, and his congregation offered to pay the sum for him, Israel replied: "I have been once redeemed by the Blood of Christ and will not be ransomed by the gold and silver of my congregation. Keep your money for the day of exile and pray for me that I may suffer boldly for Christ."

He presented himself before his judges, confessed his faith and was conducted to the dungeon which had just been vacated by Augusta and Bilek. But, after he had been confined there seven weeks he found a way of escape. At noon on the 23d of July, leaving behind him a copy of the Brethren's Confession of 1535 and a letter to the captain of the guard, he passed out quietly in the disguise of a notary, his pen behind his ear and paper and ink in his hand. He was not re-captured but escaped in safety to Prussia.

Another of the Brethren who was imprisoned at Prag, Deacon Paul Bossak, also effected his escape in a remarkable manner. He dreamed that a window was open; when he awoke he found that this was the case and escaped through this convenient opening.

He also got away safely to Prussia and was hospitably received by a wealthy exile named Matthias Svatonitz. The son of this Matthias was the famous Simon Theophilus Turnovius. John Rokita, an acolyte in Augusta's house, was also arrested. He was released at the earnest intercession of some of his fellow students on the ground that he was well qualified for a place in the royal chancery. But he rejected the place which was offered to him and followed his brethren into Poland where he became pastor at Cosminice. Many of the clergy fled to Moravia; others remained concealed among the woods and mountains, visiting their flocks in the stillness of the night and holding beneath its dark shadows their secret assemblies. A third edict of the 4th of May decreed that "all Picards who will not conform at once to the Roman or to the Bohemian Church must quit the royal domains within the space of forty-two days. If after this limited time has passed they still remain, their lives and goods are forfeited." This decree bore severely on the Brethren in five districts on the northeastern frontier, viz: Leitomischl, Brandeis, Chlum, Bidschow and Turnau; but did not apply to those dwelling in Moravia where in spite of all the efforts of their enemies they remained in peace enjoying the ministrations of their clergy.

The Bishops in Bohemia immediately after the publication of this edict sent John Girk and Adam Sturm to Prussia as envoys to Duke Albert at Königsberg to secure a place of abode for the exiles. In vain did their neighbors urge them to remain. It was represented to them that they could not safely trust in the King of Poland, Ferdinand's son-in-law, nor in the Duke of Brandenburg; that the way through the mountains of the frontier was not safe because of the robbers. They might remain peacefully in the land and go with their neighbors to the Utraquist churches, even if their own peculiar tenets were not preached there.

Some yielded to their persuasions, but others (perhaps a minority) resolved to forsake their native land and took their departure in three companies. The first of these from Leitomischl, Bidschow and Chlum, consisted of five hundred persons and sixty wagons and moved through the counties of Glatz and Oberschlesien to Poland. The second, from Turnau and Brandeis, three hundred souls and fifty wagons through the Riesengebirge and Niedersch-

lesien to Prussia. The third, from Brandeis went a similar route and consisted chiefly of the sick and aged.

The first company left Leitomischl on the 15th of June. They were kindly treated on their way through Reichenau, Dobruska, Reinerz, Glatz, Frankenstein and Breslau till on the Feast of St. John the Baptist, they arrived at Posen, the chief city of northern Poland. The royal commissioner, Andreas Count Gorka, allowed them to hire dwellings in the suburbs and neighboring villages, and favor was shown them by many of the nobility. They remained two months in Posen where their four clergymen preached and held many services on Sundays, Wednesdays and Fridays, which were well attended by the inhabitants who from the similarity of the Polish and Bohemian languages, could understand most of their discourses. On the 16th of August, Bishop Matthias Syonsky came with George Israel from Jungbunzlau to Posen to lead the wanderers on another journey. For the Roman Catholic Bishop of Posen, Isbinsky had prevailed with King Siegmund to issue an edict banishing all Picards from the kingdom. On St. Bartholomew's day they started for Eastern Prussia whither a friendly letter from the Duke had invited them. On the way they remained for a few months at Thorn in Prussian Poland where they held frequent services and converted many from the Roman faith to their own communion. Here George Israel had a lively dispute with a Roman Catholic priest, the chancellor of the Bishop of Cracow. The chancellor attempted to disprove the validity of Moravian Orders as some in our own communion have done, but was effectually silenced by the arguments of Israel. But at the beginning of the winter the edict was enforced in Thorn and the Bohemian exiles were compelled to depart. At Christmastide they reached Königsberg in safety, where they found the other companies already arrived.

In Prussia they found a country entirely devoted to the tenets of Martin Luther. In the year 1524 Duke Albrecht of Brandenburg had transformed the Teutonic domain into a secular dukedom, destined in the space of three centuries and a half to become a mighty empire.

The Reformation of the Church was conducted under the guidance of Paul Speratus, who had been sent thither by Luther at

the earnest desire of the duke. He presided over the Lutheran establishment under the title of "the Bishop of Pomerania." In 1544 the University of Königsberg was founded with the design of making it a bulwark of the Lutheran faith. When the Brethren arrived they found the University in the hands of the "high" or "orthodox" Lutherans, who regarded the teachings of the Wittenberg monk as oracular and reviled the more moderate and mild tempered Melancthon as a time server. The most violent of these Lutheran bigots was the notorious Andreas Osiander, who preached justification by faith alone without good works in such an Antinomian fashion that the most horrid scandals were the result. Under these circumstances it is by no means surprising that the Bohemian Brethren were subjected to a rigid examination of their orthodoxy. Their clergy appeared before a commission of five Lutheran divines and after a rigid examination were declared to be not hostile to the Augsburg Confession. They were allowed to dwell in Marienwerder, Neidenburg, Gardensee, Hohenstein, Gilgenburg, Soldan and Königsberg; but were subjected to very stringent and oppressive restrictions.

Under these circumstances the exiled Brethren turned their eyes toward Poland as a possible refuge. Since 1386 the royal house of the Jagellons had ruled there; King Siegmund I. closed his reign in 1548, and Siegmund II. (the last of his line) in 1572. But their rule was only a nominal one, for the Bishops and lay nobles (the Waywodes and Costellans) had things all their own way in the Diet. The sway of the Roman Catholic Church was still undisturbed, though the teachings of Huss were not unknown in the land. The old king Wladislaw had enquired about it and his two wives were zealous Bible readers. Among the nobility there were many who had received Hussite doctrines from Bohemia. The German Reformation had produced but little effect on account of the dissimilarity of the languages. Among the learned, especially at the University of Cracow where Copernicus had received his education there was an active search for knowledge and truth. In this city resided the monk Francis Lismanin of Corfu, confessor to the Queen, who had made himself acquainted with the writings of the German and Swiss reformers, and who openly expressed his doubts concerning the truth of the Roman Catholic religion.

About the same time (1542) Felix Coneizer, the priest of a village near Cracow, openly renounced the communion of the Roman Church and set up as a preacher of the gospel. Bishop Matthias Syonsky had remained in Posen since 1549 on account of his health and was lodged in the house of Lord Andreas von Lipezinski. In spite of his weakness he held frequent evening meetings at his house and received many (both nobles and burghers) into the communion of the *Unitas*.

At Michaelmas Bishop Syonsky started on a journey into Moravia to inform the Brethren there concerning the work in Poland. He soon returned and resumed his labors at Posen, but shortly after removed to Prussia and took up his abode at Gilgenburg. As the Brethren at Posen were anxious to have his place supplied by a competent priest, George Israel, who was the best acquainted with the Polish language, received the appointment. On the Wednesday after *Lentave* (i. e. Mid-Lent Sunday) he arrived in Thorn. It was the time of the Spring freshets when the rise of the river Weichsel was expected, and the magistrates had caused all the wooden bridges to be removed. But the undaunted Israel determined to cross on foot the river (the ice of which was but a few inches in thickness) and he actually succeeded in reaching an island in the Weichsel. By this time he found that the ice was breaking up and attempted to return to the city. But suddenly the ice broke up with a great crash, and the river rushed onward. Israel stood calmly on the island singing with a voice which could be heard above the roar of the waters the Psalm "*Laudate Dominum de caelis; laudate eum in excelsis, etc.*" As the ice became wedged in he commenced his return to the city, leaping from cake to cake. The burgomaster with a great multitude of people stood on the bank breathless with astonishment at this hazardous feat. He reached the shore in safety and the fame of his exploit attracted many to the religious services of the Brethren. After a few days, when the flood had subsided, he resumed his journey and reached Posen in safety. He held his first service there on the Wednesday in Passion Week. On Maundy Thursday some of the nobility were received into the communion of the *Unitas*, and on Good Friday the noble lady Catharina von Ostwrog. Israel returned to Gilgenburg with the tidings of his

success to cheer the heart of Syonsky, and then visited the congregations at Marienwerder and Gardensee. Here he heard the news of the Bishop's death on the 16th of April. Israel soon returned to Posen where many of the nobility were joining the ranks of the Brethren.

The following year (1552) Israel again visited Posen and held services in the city and its suburbs. Great care was taken to avoid publicity, for Bishop Isbinsky was watching them with jealous eyes. He had hired a band to waylay Israel, who escaped by assuming clever disguises, sometimes as a nobleman, then as a coachman, again as a cook. Isbinsky's successor, Bishop Czarnkowski, was quite as intolerant. He seized an apothecary named Jakob with several others and condemned them as heretics to the stake. But Counts Gorka and Ostwrog took them from the Bishop by force and set them at liberty. Soon after the Bishop seized the organist Paul, a cobbler by trade, and called on him to give an account of his faith. As this was not satisfactory to the prelate, he threw him into prison and appointed a day for his final trial in the Episcopal court. On the appointed day Ostwrog, Lesinski and other noblemen with a train of more than a hundred horsemen appeared at the court. When the Bishop heard of their approach he hurried up the case and pronounced sentence of death; then he hastened out to meet his unwelcome visitors and received them with an air of assumed tranquility. On being informed of the result of the trial they demanded to know the nature of the charges, but received no satisfactory answer. "I am greatly surprised," said the Bishop, "that distinguished noblemen of your rank make such an ado, as if I were interfering with your privileges; your protégé is one of the lower orders, a common cobbler." Ostwrog replied: "We do not enquire about Paul and his handiwork, but what you are doing as accuser and judge to him to-day you may do to-morrow to a Marszewski or an Ostwrog. Why conceal from us the cobbler's heresies which render him worthy of death? Who knows but what I believe just as the cobbler does? and then you must condemn me also as a heretic." "God forbid!" said the Bishop, "I know what to believe of you. Do not think so ill of me." But his flattering words availed him little, for the angry nobleman and his followers without further ceremony

seized the condemned prisoner and bore him home with them in triumph.

When the Bishops of the *Unitas* perceived that Israel could not be spared from Posen they sent another clergyman to Marienwerder and bade him take up his abode in Poland. He came to Posen on New Year's Day, 1553, and hired a house, where he held services. Count Jakob Ostwrog had not yet formally separated himself from the Roman Church, and wavered between the conflicting claims of the Calvinists, as represented by Cruciger and Stancar, and the Brethren. Ostwrog's wife invited Israel to hold a service for her in the castle. He came accompanied by Matthias Czerwenka, and the latter preached to a large company of noble ladies. This was done without the knowledge of the count, who was entertaining Roman Catholic friends in another part of the castle. One of these, who had learned of the assembly, remarked "that if *his* wife brought heretics into the house he would drive them out with a horsewhip!" The count, greatly vexed, hastened to the apartments of his wife with a heavy whip in his hand, intending to act upon the suggestion. Czerwenka, when he saw the angry count approaching, did not pause in his discourse, but addressed his remarks to Ostwrog. The latter stood still in astonishment, which was increased when Israel called out to him: "Pray, my lord, be seated!"

"And," said Ostwrog, when narrating the incident long afterwards, "if he had bidden me crawl under the benches I would not have dared to have done otherwise; so deeply was I impressed with the presence of God in this assembly." This was the turning-point in the count's life. He dismissed his Calvinist advisers, Cruciger and Stancar, abandoned the Roman Church and, together with his wife, was received into the communion of the *Unitas*. In November Israel took up his abode in the castle of Ostwrog and made it his head-quarters. The count soon after built him a parsonage-house and a stone church for Moravian worship. From this point he often visited Posen on missionary tours or sent one of his deacons.

The Reformation was making manifest headway in Poland. King Siegmund II. (to whom Calvin had dedicated his commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews) though he never openly for-

sook the communion of the Roman Catholic Church, he was not unfriendly to Protestantism and allowed (as far as his power extended) perfect religious liberty in the land. The great school of Trotzendorf in Goldberg, with its German, Polish and Bohemian scholars, contributed not a little to the diffusion of light. The new doctrines penetrated even into Lithuania, through the influence of Queen Catharina, daughter of King Ferdinand, who had brought with her the teachers of the reformation. These, under the lead of Cruciger, after frequent conferences with Israel, adopted the polity of the Bohemian Brethren as the model of their order. The situation appeared so grave for the Church of Rome, that Pope Paul IV, sent Lipomanus, Bishop of Verona, as apostolical legate to check the progress of reform. He demanded that the Poles should stand firm in defence of transubstantiation and communion in one kind. But the Polish nobility resisted his claims and demanded of the king the convocation of a National Church Council, where the advocates of the old and new religions might be freely heard. The king requested of the Council of Trent which was then in session, its sanction for divine service in the vernacular, the cup in the Eucharist, the marriage of the clergy and permission to convene a free National Council. All these requests were refused and—that was the end of the matter.

The friends of the Reformation now sought for a man of character and position to place at the head of the movement, and thought they had found such an one in the person of their countryman Johann Laski, well known in the annals of the English Reformation by the title of *John a Lasco*. His career deserves a somewhat extended notice. He was born in 1499 of an eminent family whose members had attained to high dignities both in Church and State. From his youth he was destined to the priesthood and received a very thorough education. In Basel and Zürich he came in contact with Erasmus and Zwingli, and imbibed from them his taste for reformed doctrines. Returning to Poland he entered the ranks of the priesthood and was soon after consecrated Bishop of Vespinn in Hungary and made Provost of Gnesen where his uncle was Archbishop. Here he read Luther's works and became so fully convinced of the errors of Rome that he decided to embrace Protestantism. The Bishopric

of Cujavien had just been offered to him (1537) when he decided to renounce his dignities and quit his native country. In Louvain he married a burgher's daughter and came in 1540 to Emden in East Friesland, where he set up an "Evangelical Church," according to his ideas of Bible Christianity. In his doctrines he followed the Swiss Reformers. After laboring here some years he was banished by the Emperor and betook himself in 1549 to England, where he was kindly received by Archbishop Cranmer. In London he ministered to a congregation of four thousand exiles from France and the Netherlands, who had been driven from their homes by religious persecution. Their Church government consisted of three officers, viz: Deacons, Elders and Doctors; and they were exempt by special edict of King Edward VI. from allegiance to the established Church of England.

On the death of King Edward in 1553 his sister Mary ascended the throne, revoked this indulgence and bade Bishop Laski and his reformed congregation depart from the realm. At the beginning of Winter Laski with his second wife and family and the German part of his congregation set out for Denmark. Arrived here, he found himself treated with as much severity on account of his Calvinistic views by the zealous Lutherans of that land, as he had been by the Romanists in England. Laski was permitted to remain, but the rest were roughly driven out. He experienced similar treatment in Hamburg, Lübeck and other places, till at length he found a refuge in Wismar under the wing of the Anabaptist Menno Symon (founder of the sect of the Mennonites, who had been kindly treated by him when he sojourned in East Friesland. Hence he removed again with the remnant of his flock to Emden, but was not permitted to remain. The Roman court of Brabant, and the intolerant Lutherans were equally zealous against him. After a year of vexations at Emden he betook himself to Frankfurt on the Main, where he found a part of his London congregation and other exiles from England and Scotland, among whom was the famous John Knox. Laski labored earnestly for the union of all protestant communions and with this end in view traversed (1556) the Palatinate and Würtemberg, but in vain. Hearing news of the progress of the Reformation in his native Poland, he believed that the time had arrived for his return and

accordingly set out by way of Kassel and Wittenberg. In the latter place he was kindly received by his old friend Philip Melancthon. Well provided with letters and testimonials to the King and Prince Radziwill, he arrived in Cracow, December 1556, and set himself at once to work at the task of uniting all the protestants in Poland against the Church of Rome.

When George Israel had established his headquarters at Ostrog he labored from thence as a centre and with such success that in less than six years no less than forty Moravian congregations were founded by him. Wengierski, writing at perhaps a little later date gives this catalogue of their congregations: "in Gross-Polen (i. e. Prussian Poland) sixty, in Silesia five, in Prussia eight, in Klein-Polen (i. e. Austrian Poland) a few." Their pastors did not content themselves with simply preaching justification by Faith (as Speratus complains of the Lutheran ministers in Prussia), but strove to instruct their converts in the habits of a godly life. In this respect the Reformed or Calvinists sought to imitate them and under the lead of Cruciger a desire sprang up for a more intimate union of the two communions. A synod was held at Cosminice in August, 1855, and after much deliberation the first of those fatal alliances between the Brethren and the non-episcopal sects which led ultimately to the downfall of the Polish branch of the *Unitas* was entered into. The Reformed pledged themselves by this compact to adopt the Brethren's Confession of Faith and Liturgy. When the compact was announced to Calvin, Musculus and Mostyn, they expressed their hearty approval of the measure.

Israel while on a visit to Thörn, came in contact with a man of some note in the ecclesiastical annals of the day, Bishop Peter Paul Vergerius. Born at Capo d'Istria in Dalmatia (1498), he had received a thorough theological education and attained to high dignity in the Roman Catholic Church. As the confidential friend of Pope Paul III, he was sent (1535) as papal nuncio to Germany at an epoch when the Church needed the services of its most devoted children. He subsequently became Bishop of his native city with the expectation of the cardinalate and stood high in the estimation of the Emperor Ferdinand I. But Vergerius during his sojourn in Germany had become imbued with the tenets of the Reformation; he laid aside his dignities and persuaded his brother

the Bishop of Pola, also to forsake the Roman Church. Soon after taking this decided step Paul was summoned by Duke Christopher of Würtemberg to Tübingen and there invested with the rank of a church councillor. Through Duke Albrecht of Brandenburg, he became acquainted with the Bohemian Brethren, and after investigating their organization and tenets, pronounced them nearer to the true model of primitive Christianity than anything which he had previously met. On his return to Tübingen he published an edition of their Confession of 1535 with the testimonials of Luther and Melancthon and a laudatory preface by himself. Yet, strange to say, this distinguished man and true friend of the Brethren was never received into their communion and episcopate!

One of the most singular features of the continental Reformation in the eyes of an Anglican churchman is the carelessness evinced by the reformers touching the important matter of securing an undoubted ministry for their "reformed churches."

The Reformers all pleaded *necessity* for their excuse. But they were carried along by the same notions which were dominant among their Romish adversaries, concerning the capacity of Presbyters to ordain; they were certainly not so diligent in their efforts for Episcopacy as they might have been. Had they tried harder, what was, for instance, to have kept the Reformed in France from regaining Episcopacy, when after the Conference at Poissy they were joined by *Coracioli*, Bishop of Troyes; and in Germany the Lutherans and Unionists might have done the like by the aid of some one at least of the local Bishops who befriended them—*Hermann*, Archbishop of Cologne; or *Truchsess*, Archbishop of the same; or *Von Jagau*, Bishop of Brandenburg, or others. Surely for carelessness none of these Continental Churches can be pronounced void of blame.¹

Among all the disciples of the Reformation the English, Swedish and Moravian Churches alone preserved the Apostolical Succession in their Episcopate. While in the case of the two last an unsettled doubt still hangs over their lineage, the overwhelming evidence of *probability* is in their favor. Our own communion has distinctly, in spite of the protests of some churchmen in England, recognized the Episcopacy of the Swedish Church. *Why has it not done the same to the Moravians?* The evidence in their favor is fully as clear and cogent.

If we look back for a while to the state of affairs in Bohemia

¹ The Rev. F. S. May

and Moravia we shall find them anything but promising for the well-being of the *Unitas*. The hand of persecution lay heavily on them in the former land. Wives were separated from their husbands and parents from their children. Many had emigrated to other lands, while some dragged out their weary existence at their desolated homes. The love of many had grown cold. Their chief Bishop Augusta still lay in prison and in 1549 the king, again suspecting him of conspiracy, ordered him once more to be put to the torture. His companion Bilek was spared at the earnest intercession of the castellan's wife. In October of the same year a Synod was held at Prevan in Moravia by Bishop Syonsky, who had come from Prussia for this purpose. Two youths, Blahoslaw and Rokita were sent as students to Basel at the expense of the *Unitas*. Permission was given to parents to present new-born children to Roman Catholic and Utraquist priests for Baptism, when this could be done without signifying a renunciation of the *Unitas*. No one was allowed to publish new writings, especially new hymns without license from the *Unitas*. At New Year's, 1550, Bishop Matthias summoned another Synod at Prossnitz, in Moravia, when the number of councillors, which had become greatly reduced, was increased by the addition of seven. The question was raised, How shall the consecration of future Bishops be effected, since Matthias lives at a distance and Augusta is in prison? To obviate this difficulty Bishop Matthias, with the assistance of the two aged Suffragans, Wenzel von Wrantak and Daniel von Hranitsch, and the consent of the absent Augusta consecrated three new Suffragan Bishops, *Jan Czerny*, *Streje* and *Paulin*, with the authority to consecrate new Bishops in the event of Augusta's death or continued imprisonment. The *Unitas* had now two regular Bishops and five Suffragans. The same year King Ferdinand visited Moravia with the design of obtaining from the Diet of that country an edict against the Brethren. When the Vice-chancellor announced to the Diet the king's will and pleasure, the Land-captain von Ludanitz, who belonged to the *Unitas*, replied in a spirited speech, closing with these words: "We will not swerve a hair-breadth from our convictions and I, for my part, will sooner give up my head than my faith. Sooner shall Moravia pass away in flames and ashes than that violence

shall be submitted to in this matter." The whole assembly applauded these sentiments and the mortified monarch was compelled to relinquish his designs for the present.

But in Bohemia the number of the Brethren had been reduced one-half their former strength, partly the result of the emigration and partly owing to enforced conversions to the Roman and Utraquist churches. Bishop Matthias, as we have already seen, died at Gilgenburg in 1551. Augusta lay in prison, but in better circumstances. The number of his guards had been diminished and one of them, a native of Leitomischl, was hired by the Brethren to supply their captive Bishop secretly with books, stationery, food and money. Candles were furnished him so that his dark cell was constantly illuminated. A frequent and regular correspondence was kept up between himself, the Brethren and his fellow prisoner Bilek. When the permission of Augusta was solicited for the consecration of a New Bishop in the place of Matthias Syonsky, he peremptorily refused, but at the same time nominated Johann Czerny as his representative in conducting the affairs of the *Unitas*. In the following year (1442) a general Diet was held in Prag, when the friends of the captives used their utmost endeavors to effect their release; but their efforts were unavailing. A Synod, which was held soon after under Czerny's presidency at Jungbunzlau, made another effort to secure Augusta's assent to the consecration of new Bishops. But again he refused and bade them wait in patience the day of his liberation. This line of conduct excited great dissatisfaction among the Brethren and they accused the Archbishop of seeking to assume a sort of papal authority among them. At the same time John Blahoslaw returned to Jungbunzlau. This future Bishop of the Moravians was born (1553) at Preran of a knightly family and studied theology at Wittenberg under Luther. The war drove him back to his home but, as we have seen, he was sent by the *Unitas* to Basel. There he was prostrated by an almost fatal illness and, soon after his recovery, returned to his native land. Here he was ordained deacon and became the great historian of his communion. Most of the valuable writings and documents of the *Unitas* were kept in the library at Leitomischl and were consumed in the great conflagration which occurred in 1546. A new collection was at

once commenced and after the year 1552 Blahoslaw became its custodian.

"If we," writes a Bohemian historian of the present day, "consider him and his colleagues and cotemporaries, Augusta, Matthias, Czerny, Czerwenka, Israel and others, we shall not wonder that this little band of brethren accomplished so much. They had men at the helm who in strength and devotion far surpassed all the Lutheran and Utraquist leaders of Bohemia."

In the following year (1553) the Brethren became more and more anxious about the decreasing number of their clergy. There seems to us to be no reason why the suffragans should not have ordained more priests and deacons; but they appear to have been considered a reserve force for the preservation of the Episcopate. A report obtained currency that Augusta was dead. His secret correspondence had been betrayed and the guards were changed. All his books and papers were seized and Augusta with Bilek was suddenly transferred to Prag; they and their friends supposed for immediate execution. At Prag they were thrown into the White Tower and chained together by the feet. No further harm was done to them and they were soon returned to Bürglitz where they were placed in a strict confinement as at their first arrival there. At this time, when the Brethren believed that Augusta had been executed, they convened a Synod at Prerau in June, where nearly all the priests and deacons of the entire *Unitas*, even those dwelling in Poland, were present. This great assembly elected as their Bishops, *Johann Czerny* and *Matthias Czerwenka*, and, in the absence of Augusta, the Suffragan-Bishops Streje and Paulin consecrated them to their office. This consecration appears to have been in every respect valid, and had there been any defect about it, it would have been repaired by the episcopal consecrations which Augusta performed after his release. Then followed the ordination of presbyters in larger numbers than ever before, and a canon was passed forbidding *deacons to perform priestly rites*.¹

The storm which had threatened the life of Augusta passed over

¹A rule, by the way, which it would be well for the Moravians of the present day to observe more closely. By what authority do their deacons venture to confirm and to consecrate the Holy Eucharist?

and left him unharmed. His papers, in which the king had thought to find treasonable correspondence with the Markgraf of Brandenburg and the Elector Moritz of Saxony, proved to treat only of religious topics and the wrath of the monarch was greatly appeased.

The Brethren in Bohemia were now entirely dependent on the good-will of individual noblemen for their protection. Among their friends was Lord Ernst von Krajek, who like his forefathers was devoted to the interests of the *Unitas* and not only allowed the re-opening of their assemblies, but also in 1554 built them a large church edifice.

The Lord von Pernstein obeyed the edict and closed the churches at Reichenau, Senftenberg and Kunwald, which were on his estates. But he soon relaxed his obedience and suffered the churches to be re-opened. Lord Kostka at Brandeis on the Adler seemed indisposed to favor the Brethren as his ancestors had done. He suffered some of their number to be arrested and conveyed to Prag; but they were ultimately released without further injury. About this time a large number of Lutheran preachers with their wives and children were driven out of the country and betook themselves to Saxony and the Rhenish Palatinate. Even some of the nobility became the victims of the king's wrath. Among these was John (or Joachim) von Prostibor, a man of talent and learning but not rich in worldly goods. The king suspected him of having entered into conspiracy with the Saxons, had him arrested and put to the rack. Prostibor with heroic firmness bit off his tongue and spat it out. When asked why he had done this injury to himself, he wrote as his answer that he had done it to give a convincing proof to those who had put no faith in his declarations that no torture which they could inflict would cause him to swerve from the truth. He was put in prison and soon after died of his wounds.

About this time the Brethren under the advice of Blahoslaw, conceived the design of enlisting in their behalf the favor of the king's eldest son. This young prince (afterwards the Emperor Maximilian II.) had for a long time manifested a strong inclination toward the doctrines of the Reformation. He corresponded with Melancthon and other leaders of the Protestant party and was

regarded by those who knew him best as being at heart a Protestant. The matter gave his father great anxiety and alarm, since it was not improbable that all which he had labored to build up would be pulled down by his immediate successor. As this disposition of the Crown Prince was well known in Bohemia, Lord von Krajek pointed him out as a willing protector of the *Unitas*, and Blahoslaw, then thirty-two years of age, conducted the negotiations. In March, 1555, he came to Vienna to feel his way in the matter. He ascertained that Maximilian had entirely forsaken the Roman Catholic priests and would listen only to Pastor Pfauser, a married Lutheran minister. Blahoslaw went to hear him. In external appearance he resembled Luther; he was an earnest, though by no means eloquent, preacher. After several days' effort Blahoslaw found an opportunity to speak with Pfauser alone. The latter did not conceal the friendship of the Grand Duke for the Protestants and complained bitterly of the wiles of the Jesuits. At length Blahoslaw declared himself to be a member of the *Unitas Fratrum* and gave a vivid description of Augusta's sufferings. He handed Pfauser a copy of the Confession which had been presented to the king, and besought him to use his influence with the young prince to mitigate the severity of the persecution. This Pfauser willingly promised and said that when Maximilian came to the throne he would prove their protector and friend.

When Blahoslaw returned he found that Lord Krajek was dead. His four sons yielded to the mandates of the king and Jungbunzlau ceased to be a safe refuge for the Brethren. But Czerny and Blahoslaw remained in the vicinity and administered the affairs of the church. At the end of the year 1555, a Synod was held at Prossnitz in Moravia, and the compilation of a new hymnal ordered which should include many new hymns, especially those composed by Bishop Augusta. Czerny, Blahoslaw and Adam Sturm were intrusted with this work. It was resolved also that Blahoslaw should be sent again to Vienna with another petition to Maximilian. At his second interview with Pfauser, Blahoslaw heard many discouraging things concerning the bigotry of the aged king. A copy of the petition to his son has been preserved in history. It is somewhat remarkable that it assumes through-

out that Maximilian, to whom it was addressed, was already a Protestant. Pfauiser praised the document and engaged to present it to the Grand Duke. But nothing came of it. The next year (1556) Blahoslaw sent a present of a knife and cheese to Pfauiser and begged for an answer, even if it were a short one. An answer was soon received to the effect that Maximilian had read the petition, was pleased with it and would use his utmost influence to have it granted. The prince it seems could or would accomplish nothing.

About this time Blahoslaw entered into correspondence with the learned Flacius Illyricus of Magdeburg, one of the most zealous disciples of Luther. Flacius it seems had formed an idea from his historical researches that the Bohemian Brethren were the immediate descendants of the Piedmontese Waldenses and wrote for further facts in support of his opinion. The Brethren replied to him courteously but firmly denying the truth of the report and showing that it would be quite as proper for one to say that Luther was the immediate descendant of the Brethren. Flacius received their messengers kindly and sought to prove to them out of ancient writings that the *Unitas* must have been derived from the Waldenses because it held and taught a "purer faith than that of Huss and Rokyzan." Blahoslaw disproved all his assertions and Flacius was deeply offended. The next day he spoke in angry terms of the Brethren, upbraiding them for the mutability of their dogmas, their equivocal theory of justification, and because they held themselves aloof from the Lutherans. Blahoslaw replied with vehemence, asking why the Lutherans could not agree among themselves; to which Flacius replied blaming the men at Wittenberg. The next day Blahoslaw left Magdeburg and described Flacius to the Brethren as a zealous, learned and well-meaning, but, at the same time, a haughty, stiff-necked and unyielding man. From Magdeburg Blahoslaw journeyed to Wittenberg. Here he found great corruption of morals and lawlessness of life among the people, and those who should have been their guides; and as much bitter hostility against Illyricus as he had manifested toward the Wittenbergers. Protestantism was already beginning to bear its bitter fruits. On his return Blahoslaw wrote in 1557 a short treatise in the Latin tongue on the history of the *Unitas Fratrum*—the first ever pub-

lished. Illyricus from this time forth manifested ill-will toward the Brethren.

Bishop Vergerius on the other hand showed himself to be their constant friend. By his advice many of the Polish nobles, among them Lukas von Gorka and the Counts Ostrorog and Raphael Lescenski, addressed a petition to the Duke of Würtemberg, begging him to use his influence with Maximilian for the release of Augusta. John Rokita, chaplain to Count Ostrorog, carried the petition to the Duke, who cheerfully complied with the request and despatched a letter to Maximilian. As Rokita fell sick in Prag, Blahoslaw went on with the letter to Vienna. Here he learned from Pastor Pfauser, as before, that the young prince was well-disposed toward the Brethren and anxious to obtain the prisoner's release, but could not influence his father, who was completely under the control of the Jesuits. Yet a fourth time Blahoslaw traveled to Vienna the same year, but with no better success. By this time nearly all the churches of the Brethren in Bohemia were closed; in 1558 there remained only three, hidden in the mountains, viz.: at Senftenberg, Wildenschwert and Brandeis on the Adler. Yet the local elections show that at this time in Eastern Bohemia the Brethren constituted the majority of the inhabitants of that region. The *Unitas* was presided over by Bishop Czerwenka, who resided at Prerau. Bishop Czerny traveled about in Bohemia, being often forced to conceal himself from his enemies. Prossnitz and Cybenschütz, as well as Prerau, were important towns of the Brethren in Moravia, and in the last-named Blahoslaw had fixed his residence. Here the *Unitas* flourished, free from persecution, and many lists of their clergy are still in existence. At a Synod held in Prerau in 1556 it was determined that aged members of their communion should not be allowed to travel about begging for alms; but that the *Unitas* should see that they were provided for. In the case of Brethren who were compelled to attend the Church services of the Utraquists it was resolved that this should be esteemed no defection, provided that the principles of their communion were not renounced.

JOHN ANKETELL.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE IMPORTANCE OF ETHICAL PREACHING.

We justly eulogize the wisdom of our Church in securing, by the arrangement of the Ecclesiastical Year the orderly presentation of all Christian *doctrine*. But we have no corresponding arrangement for the presentation of Christian *duty*.

The "Dutch Reformed Church" provides for this object by the regulation that her clergy shall deliver, every third year, lectures or sermons on her catechism. That includes, of course, both doctrine and duty. It would seem that such a regulation could not fail to enlarge the scope and enhance the salutary influence of the pulpit.

"I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God," said St. Paul to the elders of Ephesus. No portion of the revealed truth and will of God which He has commissioned His ministers to proclaim can be innocently or lawfully omitted in their ministrations.

The relation of doctrine to duty, of truth to practice, of faith to works is luminously clear and simple in the Bible and in our standards. The duty results from the doctrine, the practice *is the truth lived*, the work is faith working. Our Article calls "good works the fruits of faith," and the Presbyterian confession compresses the same meaning into the phrase "truth is in order to goodness."

Great is the evil of cutting in two, in theory or practice, this one, living, fruit-bearing tree of faith. Trees may be wisely pruned and purged in order that they may bring forth more fruit. But if they be cut off and kept cut off at the point where the branches spring which are to bear the fruit, they will soon cease to be even dead trees and become rotting stumps.

A paper read at a meeting of the clergy of Philadelphia in the Penn Club Hall, January 8, 1877.

The evils which have resulted from this severance are seen, in the large, in the history of the Church at various eras. It showed itself even in the Apostolic Church. St. Paul and St. James denounced it. In the Pre-Nicene period, the very age of martyrs, it often appeared in the form of heresy and licentious living. Later, when the truth of the Gospel was trampled under foot by fanatical superstition, this separation became most complete. In the eighth century John of Damascus, the greatest theologian of the day, closed a vehement oration on the duty of worshipping images with the following story: A holy hermit was assailed by the demon of uncleanness. The demon offered to leave the holy man if he would cease to worship an image of the Virgin. The hermit consented, but communicated his secret to a famous abbot, his spiritual adviser. "Better," said the abbot, "that you should visit every brothel in town than abstain from the worship of the holy images." We all know how much Rome magnifies dogma above morals, and how she corrupts morals in the interests of dogma. Fantastic and horrible were the Antinomian extravagancies which resulted, in the period of the commonwealth in England, from the exclusive presentation and the perversion of the blessed truth of a free salvation. Never were morals more preached or less practised than when the semi-Pelagian divines of the last century, discarding doctrine as unprofitable mystery and spiritual life as fanaticism, depicted the charms of virtue. Men and women are not changed into grand and beautiful creatures by gazing on grand and beautiful portraits.

While, however, it is true that no portion of the revealed will of God can be ignored without detriment to truth and to practical morality, it is also true that the *stress* to be laid upon the different portions of the great body of truth should be determined by the condition of those who are addressed and the needs of the Church and the world at the time and place in which they minister. My conviction is that this is a time in which there is great need for the full and vivid presentation of the ethical side of the Gospel revelation.

Moreover, in urging as I do a larger presentation of the ethics of the Gospel in proportion to the doctrines of the Gospel than is usual in our pulpits, I shall be greatly misunderstood if it shall

be inferred that I forget for a moment that the first, the last, the supreme, the only duty (I may say) of the minister of Christ is to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom. The good news of salvation through faith in an Incarnate and crucified Redeemer—that is our one message. And the preaching of Christian duty is included in that message. There cannot well be a comparison, as between separate things, of the relative importance of the doctrine and the spiritual life and the Christian works that flow from them. It is another form of the inept question, "Which is the most important, the tree or its fruits?" So presented it is not a question except in form, and can have no answer. But this statement may, must be given; there must first be Divine life and then there will be Divine work. It may not be much but it will correspond to the amount of spiritual vitality. Some little life there may be where there is not a possibility of much movement. A living man may be bed-ridden, and so may a Christian character. A man may live after a poor fashion without arms or legs; but if you cut off his head or cut out his heart, he must be put under ground. A malformed or mutilated Christian, so long as he has a Christian head and a Christian heart however small and feeble they may be will move about a little and do a little something.

But there is among some of the clergy, much less among our pious laymen, a dread of ethical preaching as if it were necessarily legal, and would certainly lead men to rely upon their good works for salvation. That depends upon how it is done. If a man cannot, like St. Paul, preach Christian duty as the direct outcome of Christian truth and life, then that is a good reason why *he* should not preach good works. But it is a question whether it is not an equally good reason why *he* should not preach at all. It does indeed require more careful thinking and more moral force to treat such topics with discrimination and to edification than to repeat in well worn phrases favorite doctrines and obvious exhortations; but a little more thinking and moral force is, in the case of some of our clergy, a thing to be desired. But some, who could do this well, so deeply feel that the love of Christ and the life of the Spirit in their hearts is the glorious and ever efficient motive of all *their* diligence in duty that it seems to them a waste of time, a want of fidelity to the Master, to dwell upon the details of

Christian duty in the various spheres of life, when the one needed truth alike for dying sinners and lukewarm saints is Christ and Him crucified. "Fill men," they say, "with the love of Christ and then from the promptings of the holy and loving life which He imparts, they will seek out and enter and faithfully till every field of duty. Make the tree good and the good fruit will certainly come. Charge men, by the preaching of Christ, salvation from sin and the prospect of Heaven, with a rich pulsating Christian vitality, and they will know how to direct it aright. It is a sort of impertinence to tell these men, heirs of Heaven, not to lie and cheat." But this is what St. Paul did.

It is no doubt the law of the Christian life that it should come forth in all good works. If it could be trusted always to follow that law we should never need to speak of duty, but could confine ourselves to those great truths which through the Spirit impart and strengthen the spiritual life. Angels need no exhortations to duty and no dissuaves from sin. The supreme law of their being, not hindered in its working by another law in their members leads them always to delight to fulfill God's Commandments. But with us it is not so. How does the history of the Church from the times of the Apostles until now abound in testimonies to the melancholy fact that men may possess a real spiritual life and yet not give it a right practical direction. That life takes such outward forms for the most part in any given age, as the teachings of the age indicate to be its legitimate development. Now it is persecuting zeal. Now it is ascetic self-repression and self-punishment. Now it is mystical absorption in God, which rejects all common duty as a sin that interferes with the supreme duty of the constant and conscious abiding of the soul in God. It cannot be denied that a real Christian life, the work of the Spirit of God, often takes abnormal and melancholy directions. Multitudes, whole generations, have had laid in their hearts the true foundation, but have built upon it wood, hay, stubble.

We cannot therefore safely take this ground, that our only business is to lead men to Christ, in the assurance that the Divine life which He imparts will certainly take the right direction and come forth in right forms. We must open the channels in which it should run, and guide it in its goings. We must say with St.

Peter "believe," and "add to your faith virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity," and we must explain what all these graces are, and what are their practical issues. Our Saviour not only proclaimed the new birth to Nicodemus, but He also preached the Sermon on the Mount. I think if one should cull from the Epistles all their teachings and exhortations in reference to plain elementary moral duty he would be surprised at the amount of them. We cannot err if we make them occupy as large a space proportionally in our ministrations. Shall we not err if we allow them to occupy less?

And now I reach the question whether our pulpit does its full duty in this respect. I think I shall not be contradicted by the older clergy when I say that there was a deplorable deficiency in this respect in the pulpit ministrations forty years ago. The Churchly men were then much given to preaching "Bishops, Priests and Deacons"—good things which, however, the shoemaker and carpenter and merchant could not put to a practical use during the week. They varied these instructions with solemn protests against Low churchmen, prayer meetings and Presbyterians. The Evangelicals—I must claim this—did a great work, whose influence is felt now by every party in the Church, by their vivid and distinct proclamation of the supreme necessity of the life of God in the soul—the free gift of God to the faith which justifies and sanctifies and saves. But they too had their shibboleths and their pet aversions. They too, even more than the other school, avoided ethical preaching having an unfortunate association of good works with filthy rags. *Their* warning cry was—"Baptismal Regeneration, High Churchmanship and Oxford Tracts." Both parties ran into well worn ruts in their preaching. Of course this description would be mere caricature if it were understood otherwise than as an indication of the topics upon which the main stress was laid. In contrast, too, to the kindly feeling which pervades all the Church parties of to-day there was much polemical bitterness, an exaggerated view of the damnable nature of the errors which were reciprocally denounced, and a pronounced antagonism which was felt no less in social than in Church circles. A spirit prevailed on both sides very much like that of Luther in the saying which he often piously and mournfully repeated, "Blessed

is the man that hath not walked in the counsel of the Zwinglians, nor stood in the way of the Sacramentarians, nor sat in the seat of the Zurickers!"

But since then and more especially within fifteen or twenty years there has been a great and happy change. We have excellent preaching on all sides in our Church to-day. All schools and parties in our day, high and highest, low and lowest, broad and broadest, present doctrine and duty, church order and spiritual life more nearly in their proper place, relation and proportion than has ever been done before. And what is most delightful to see is that all these schools, with slight differences in methods, have inaugurated a new era, I may call it, in the history of our Church by a three-fold development of zealous and successful activity.

In all our churches the laity of both sexes, young and old, have been enlisted in direct work for the Master—in gathering men and women into the fold and in teaching them the way of life. The blessed results are seen in men's and women's Bible classes, in mothers' meetings, in mission schools and churches, and in more methods of Christian activity than I could enumerate, even if I knew them. This is a most cheering manifestation of Christian and Church life in our day. And there is still another which seems to have sprung directly from it. The fraternal social side of Christian life, in the sacred fellowship of the Church, and in mutual labors of love has been and is beautifully developed and exemplified. Converts have been taught and made to feel that the Christian life is a joyful, loving, social thing, that they need not go out of Church into evil associations to find all that their nature craves and needs. Hence men's Reading Rooms and Clubs and young people's various societies for work and for social enjoyment. These are admirable developments of Christian and Church life. My soul rejoices in them. I never look in upon them without saying to myself—"Oh that such had been the condition and the spirit of the Church when I commenced my ministry!" Sometimes I confess I have seen and heard of the doings of young people in these associations which have made me feel that they need a careful pastoral eye over them. When Brigham Young opened a theatre in Salt Lake City he said that he would have no gloomy

Gentile tragedies enacted in it; but that it was to be consecrated to *holy fun*. Just what that is I do not know, but I have heard of things which lead me to infer that some of the young people's associations take the fun and leave out the holy!

There is still a third admirable development of renewed Christian vitality and activity in our churches. They have all or almost all come to the conviction that it is in perfect accordance with the principle upon which our sacred Church seasons have been arranged—that it is in fact an exemplification of that principle—that there should be continuous services, varied according to individual convictions, within lawful limits, in which there shall be special efforts to waken careless and dying sinners and rouse slumbering saints; and the ministers who officiate on these occasions are quickened to seek from the Spirit of God an unction and a zeal which will enable them to put into their ministrations the most emphatic and impressive teachings and exhortations. Hence special series of services and the enlistment reciprocally of the aid of various clergymen, and the combination of brethren of differing schools to seek from the great Head of the Church larger ingatherings into the fold.

Notwithstanding these great improvements in preaching and practice in our day it cannot be denied that the Christian life, which finds fit expression in the channels I have indicated, does not to the same extent manifest itself in a high discriminating and pure Christian morality. We need now but to add this, as a marked characteristic of our pulpit and our membership, to make our Church a most efficient agent in enlarging the Redeemer's Kingdom. It may be questioned whether the tendency to excessive ritual may not have arisen from the sameness and incompleteness of the pulpit, from the craving on the part of minister and people for *something more*, which would have found its legitimate gratification in the vivid unfolding of the whole glorious Gospel in its application to the needs and sins of our time, in connection with activity in those blessed fields of labor of which I have just spoken.

Certain it is that no thoughtful observer of our commercial, political and social life can fail to be struck with the degree to which professedly and seemingly Christian men fail to carry out

the moralities of the Gospel in their daily transactions in the world. There have been exhibitions of sharp practice in the world, and of pious appropriations of the results of it to churches and institutions which it is difficult to distinguish from Mediaeval and Romish methods of offsetting sin by pecuniary sanctity. We have specimens of piety not unlike that commemorated by John Foster. Some one said to him that Alexander I. of Russia was a very pious man: "Yes, sir, a very good man; no doubt he said grace when he swallowed Poland." So marked is this feature of the times that it presents itself as a problem difficult to solve. Why is it that when the churches exhibit an unusual degree of Christian activity, fraternal love, liberality and zeal, Christian men in the world are so often seen to act on immoral principles and become involved in distinctly immoral and fraudulent transactions? What is there—if there be anything—in our methods of preaching, teaching, administering and living, which leads or opens a way to this deplorable result? I make no attempt to explain the problem. I only venture to suggest that the failure of the pulpit sufficiently to teach and emphasize the ethical side of the Gospel may be one of the many causes which might be stated as having contributed to produce the lax principle and practice which now so frightfully prevail. We all know that it has been, in all ages, one of "the depths of Satan" to lead men to suppose that they can offset moral delinquencies, sometimes by high spiritual fervors and sometimes by large gifts and abundant labors in the Church. That this feeling prevails in our day as it has in every age there can be no doubt. Men who kneel at our Communion tables and are active in Church work, how often do we know and how frequently is it proved by public exposure and disgrace that they have combined a seeming—who shall say that it was originally not a *real*—spiritual life with such moral laxness of principle as has led at last to crime. I do not charge this as a sin which peculiarly besets our Church, for it is in all the churches. If one is not prepared to admit that this result is due to the want of a faithful inculcation of the morals of the Gospel from the pulpit, can he deny that it is a present and urgent call upon it for more diligent instruction in righteousness, for persuasive and attractive exhibitions of whatsoever things are true, just, lovely and of good re-

port; for rousing denunciations of falsehood and fraud; and for an emphatic testimony, that shall make the ears of the guilty Christian tingle, that they who do such things cannot inherit the Kingdom of God.

Especially do the Christian men of this day need to be warned with an impassioned solemnity and earnestness against the awful and soul-destroying lie, which Satan has palmed off on this generation, that the crime or fraud which is committed by one as a member of a corporation, or a crime against a corporate body, is attenuated into nothingness because committed against or divided among a multitude. The churches should be roused to preach a vehement crusade against this atrocious immorality. It pervades all classes. It debauches the public conscience. It is eating out the moral life of the nation. It is the first article in the unwritten constitution of rings. It is an axiom—or it is acted upon as if it were—of professed politicians, of many corporations, of multitudes of citizens in their dealings with corporations, and with governments. You cross the ocean and have much edifying conversation with a devout Christian gentleman, and as you approach New York he consults you as to the surest method of cheating the custom house. This actually happened to myself. It is perfectly frightful the extent to which this dreadful axiom—a direct denial of the most fundamental principles of morality—prevails avowedly in the world, and practically in the churches. If this state of things continues unrebuked by the pulpit, if there be not an uprising of all the moral forces of the churches and the nation to crush it out, then the tablet of our law will be the tombstone of our liberty, and this pernicious lie of Satan will be its epitaph! If at such a time the pulpit is silent it will not be infidels alone who will ask, “What is the Church good for if it is careless or afraid to grapple with and expose, with persistent reiteration, this dreadful perversion not only of Christian but of all morality?”

If I were in a position to speak with a voice of authority to the clergy and the churches I would say—“Let your questions of Ritual and Baptism and Eucharist and Ceremonial stand aside at present, and let there be poured through the churches such a strong stream of instruction, remonstrance and appeal upon this subject as shall sweep away these refuges of lies, and cleanse and purify the desecrated Church of God!

The Christian pulpit at a time like this should proclaim with a clearness and emphasis which should enforce attention and assent, that it is impossible to divide and subdivide moral action. If I, as one of twenty, do a deed, it is morally considered mine as wholly as if it were mine alone. If I have a transaction with a body composed of a hundred, a thousand, a million persons it is my whole act a hundred, a thousand, a million times repeated. So that moral responsibility is not diminished but vastly increased by the number of persons affected by an act. If a man appropriate the funds of a corporation he defrauds every individual who holds the stock. If one dips his hand into the treasury of a municipality and appropriates the funds to his own use he cannot meet a citizen in the street whom he has not cheated. Moral responsibility is not, like matter, infinitely divisible. "It spreads undivided, operates unspent." But the pernicious opinion widely prevails that dishonest action through or against corporations loses in large part the quality of wrong-doing, and even when detected and exposed becomes mere misfortune or mistake. It is astonishing and melancholy to see how men guilty of this enormous crime, whose proper place is the penitentiary, hold up their heads and resume their places in the business world. It is all and awfully wrong. We should confute and denounce these dreadful moral heresies with an energy corresponding to the evils which they involve and spread.

Such are some of the main and most urgent reasons, as they seem to me, which should lead to a larger presentation than is usual from the pulpit of the ethics of the Gospel. But there are other reasons which are scarcely less important; and in enumerating them I must again insist that it shall not for a moment be forgotten that I would have such preaching only in the proportion sanctioned by divine precedents, and as the immediate outcome of Gospel grace and life.

It would greatly improve and give increased variety and interest to the ministrations of the pulpit. Congregations are always immensely interested when the pulpit treats with discrimination of the fruits of the spirit, as they are graces of the heart, and as the life of them develops into holy living. And it is not an unlawful thing, but a duty, to strive to give new interest and attrac-

tion to the weekly preaching of the word. Some have tried to do so by the introduction of topics which belong rather to the chair of the scientific Professor or to scientific and literary journals. Not only is this a departure from the true work of the preacher of the Gospel, but, however it may interest some portions of an audience for a time, it will fail from the first and increasingly to reach that at which it is the business of the preacher to strike through the intellect, the conscience and the heart. Nothing can compare or compete in permanent interest to an audience with the great, complete, manifold Gospel of the grace of God.

I suppose we all have known godly men and even ministers who seemed to think that it is a departure from the simplicity of the Gospel to present the great message of salvation otherwise than in a bald and technical style; and that it is the duty of the preacher to repress and crucify all his individual gifts and peculiarities in order to reach a certain conventional form of treatment and a certain sanctioned phraseology which should at once announce us to a congregation as thoroughly faithful to the truth. There was a good deal of this prescriptive spirit and habit among the clergy of the Evangelical school in former years. In my early ministry a godly old friend and father in the Church solemnly remonstrated with me because my preaching, as he said, was not sufficiently plain. He objected, not that there was a failure to present and unfold the old truths I had in hand, but to the illustrations and figures which would occur to me, which it was natural for me to use and which it would have been most unnatural in me to reject. The truth is that the good man made the limits of his own rather narrow capacity the solemn rule of duty for others differently constituted and endowed. Admitting the probable justice of his criticism, I yet summoned courage to say to him that on his theory neither Christ himself nor St. Paul were plain preachers, and that it seemed to me that he was the plainest preacher who made the truth most plain.

And now admitting that it is not wrong to be interesting in the pulpit, that is to interest in the right way the congregations to whom we minister, it will be found that by no method can the preacher become so more surely than by doing his whole duty to his Master's message, and by delivering all doctrine and duty in

their right place and measure. He will find that the preaching of Gospel morality will exceedingly profit and interest his people. They need and desire to be instructed in daily duty. Daily life is full of moral tangles, and they are most grateful to one who helps them to untie the knots and disengage the implicated threads of seemingly conflicting obligations and to straighten them all out before them. The treatment of such topics will greatly refresh and enrich the preacher's own mind, and his whole style will take on a finer and more impressive expression. Nor need we fear that we shall become artificial by seeking every lawful mode of access to the hearts and consciences of men in the treatment of those questions of duty in which they are or should be interested. All the gifts with which we have been endowed and all the attainments we have acquired can and should be employed in rendering the teachings and exhortations of the pulpit such as should wake up and stimulate the mental, moral and spiritual nature of those to whom we minister. "Nature," says Sir Thomas Browne, "is the art of God." We are most natural when we imitate His art.

And indeed some such relief as this to the exhausting labor of constant pulpit preparation is greatly needed. It is a prodigious strain upon a man's soul always to preach with the intensity which the theme demands, twice a day month in and month out, the great Gospel of salvation, with the impassioned appeal to sinners and saints which comes up burning on the preacher's lips when that salvation lies before his soul in all its love and awfulness, its mercy and its justice. And it is in the interest of the most solemn possible presentation of the Gospel that I would plead for this proclamation of the whole counsel of God. It is when the preacher varies this great theme with profitable teachings upon daily duty, that he reverts ever, with new force and freshness, to that salvation and that spiritual life without which Christian morality is impossible. If it be true that the pulpit is losing its hold upon the minds of this generation—which I doubt—I do not believe it is to be regained by the omission or half-hearted presentation of the doctrine of Christ crucified or by rivalry with the methods and the topics of the platform and the rostrum, but by the full and vivid presentation of the truth as it is in Jesus, *in connection* with

all the holy moralities, the loving beneficence and the beautiful affections which follow its reception. To that completely rounded system of doctrine and of duty there can be no rival in impressiveness and grandeur, in attractiveness for poor sinful hearts, in the present peace and joy which it gives and in the glorious future it promises and secures. The men of this generation are aching to hear this two-fold Gospel of salvation and of life, and are ready to cry out with joy when it is heard. They are in fact more willing to hear a clerical mountebank who does this thing than the most decorous and dainty and orthodox divine who does it not.

It is a great wrong done to this glorious message when it is delivered but in part. It is a still greater wrong when the constant reiteration of its most solemn messages in fixed phrases and with diminished life, makes it a dull humming which falls on unheeding ears. I am afraid that there are those who denounce the formalism of ritual who fall into the no more respectable formalism of dogma. Certain it is that the preacher who limits himself to a narrow range of topics and goes over them again and again with the same or similar modes of presentation does not impress a congregation even in the points upon which he most earnestly labors. The mind loses its vigor and elasticity if it dwells always on one or a few themes only. The more important they are and the higher tension of soul which they demand in their contemplation the more likely are the mind and the heart to flag and become weary and ultimately feeble through a constant and unvaried strain upon them. In short it cannot be denied that many good men who adopt this method and present nothing but what is true and orthodox and solemn, become rather dull.

The hearer's perplex'd

'Twixt the two to determine;

"Watch and pray," says the text—

"Go to sleep," says the sermon.

We may, moreover, be sure that when we develop Christian duty with fullness and power we are thereby preparing the sinner to flee to the cross from the penalty of the violated law which he is made to see that in manifold points he has broken, and which he is made to feel that he can never fully obey. The

child of God will be thereby made to feel the preciousness of a free salvation by the blood of Christ, be led to consecrate himself anew to the service of his master, and to resolve to walk more warily and constantly in the ways of His laws and in the works of His commandments.

By this method we show that Christianity is not a system of mere dogma and abstraction, but a living force from which proceed those virtues which all men know to be noble in themselves and blessings to the world; and thus shall these preached and practised virtues of the Gospel be gentle schoolmasters to win men to the Saviour from whom they come.

If we could preach as we pray in our closets we should find no difficulty in putting in their right place and proportion the theoretical and the practical, the doctrine and the duty, the life and its manifold manifestations. There we are all good theologians. There we seek strength from the Cross to be put into all daily duty. There we see how duty imperfectly fulfilled makes the Cross inexpressibly precious. If we preach as we pray, then a loving Father, a crucified Saviour, a sanctifying Spirit cannot be presented in our sermons otherwise than as the holy source whence holy living must and will proceed; and the holy living proceeding from them cannot but be unfolded and displayed in all its Divine beneficence and beauty.

C. M. BUTLER.

THE TRIAL OF JESUS CHRIST FOR TREASON.

To the mind of a modern lawyer the trial and crucifixion of Jesus Christ presents at least three distinct legal queries :

I. Whether Pilate was invested with any, and if any, *sufficient* judicial authority to try a subject for treason.

II. Whether he was authorized by the Roman Law he pretended to administer to try a subject for treason without calling and employing a jury of Assessors.

III. And whether he was authorized by the Roman Law, without first having obtained special leave from the Governor General of Syria, to inflict the death penalty.

The examination of these queries by the light of the fragments of evidence extant upon them constitutes the subject matter of the following notes.

I. "Whether Pilate was invested with any, and if any, sufficient judicial authority to try a subject for treason."

Beyond all question the Province of Judæa at that time did not rank either as a kingdom, ethnarchy, or tetrarchy, but only and merely as an appendage of Syria ; and all its provincial officers were subordinate and directly amenable to Vitellius, then the Governor General of Syria. All the so-called Mediterranean Provinces, inclusive of Judæa, had previously been conquered and reduced to Roman subjection by Pompey. And the forms of government which the Cæsars had dispensed to them as subject territories, other things being equal, appear to have been measured to them in dignity and delegated authority according to their respective populations, loyalty of behavior, tributal capacity and area of domain. During the life time of Herod the Great, Judæa enjoyed the dignity of a petty kingdom. After his death it was reduced to a tetrarchy ; and after that in consequence of various disturbances and the putting to death of John the Baptist by

Herod Antipas, it was annexed to Syria. It appears to have been reduced to a dependency both on account of the seditious conduct of its inhabitants and the bad behavior of its ruler. It is sufficient for this examination to find that it had been, with or without sufficient cause, blotted out as a tetrarchy and annexed to another province, and the character and functions of its chief officer reduced to the new situation of subordination to the paramount and superior government of Syria.

This preliminary fact being established by all the credible histories, it is in order next to ascertain, if we can, precisely what the functions of its chief officer were. Josephus styles him a "Procurator." Jacob, Anthon and Andrews in their Law Dictionaries define the term "Procurator" to have been one who had charge of the imperial revenues of a province in the times of the Emperors, a collector. The Evangelists style him "Governor." And Conybeare and Howson in their notes to their "Life and Epistles of St Paul," advance the idea that although that functionary was primarily and essentially a collector of the imperial revenues he was permitted in some way to exercise the functions of a modern Lieutenant Governor of a single province under the supervision and superintendency of a Governor General of several adjacent provinces; and that Pilate sustained similar relations to the Governor General, sometimes called the President, of Syria at Antioch, that the Lieutenant Governors of Bombay and Madras sustain to the Governor General of Calcutta. The highest functions which any of the Jewish *Rabbis*, whose works are accessible to the writer, claim for Pilate, appear to have been only and merely those possessed by subordinate provincial rulers. And although I find abundant evidence in Roman history and Roman enactments and decrees for believing that the *Cæsars* invested their Pro-Consuls and Governor Generals, such as Cicero at Cilicia, with judicial powers, I am utterly unable to find any for believing that they invested their Procurators with any judicial power whatever. All the presumptions from the fragments of evidence extant are to the effect that *they did not*, because I find that at least two of the Procurators of Judæa, Herod Antipas and Pontius Pilate, were removed from their offices for presuming to exercise it as they did in cases which included those of John the Baptist and the Saviour.

Josephus affords us some light upon this point by what he says of the displeasure of Tiberias Cæsar at the acts of the predecessors of Pilate beyond their authority. The first Procurator, Annius Rufus, sent by him to Judæa provoked no displeasure; but the second one, Valerius Gratus, did. The first one appreciated his subordinate position, and ventured to assume no authority except in subordination to his superior at Antioch, to whom and through whom to Rome he made all his official returns; but the second one was more assuming and officious, and gave offence by presuming to exercise authority independent of, if not in opposition to, his superior officer. And although Josephus is careful not to say that Pilate displeased his monarch by his unwarranted exercise of judicial authority in the case of the Saviour, he does say that on the complaint of the Governor General, his superior officer, he was censured, removed from office and disgraced for causing the death of numbers of the contumacious Samaritans. And, according to Eusebius, he was not only removed and disgraced for his conduct as Procurator in Judæa, but was punished for it by banishment to Gaul, where he committed suicide in the year A. D. 38. We are unable to consult Tacitus upon this point for the reason that his chapters, which cover the latter years of the reign of that Cæsar, are said to be lost. But upon his supposed or presumed authority, Philo, Eusebius and other cotemporaries assert that Pilate acted as a Judge in criminal matters because his predecessors so acted before Judæa was annexed to Syria, when there was no Proconsul over them. In the article on Pilate, in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, published in 1797, it was, among other things, stated that although "the Evangelists called him Governor he was in reality no more than a Procurator. They called him Governor because he, in effect, acted as one by taking upon him to judge in criminal matters, as his predecessors had done, and as other Procurators constantly did in the small provinces of the Empire where there was no Proconsul. He was at length deposed by Vitellius, the Proconsul of Syria, in the thirty-sixth year of our Lord and sent to Rome to give an account of his conduct to the Emperor. But though Tiberias died before Pilate arrived at Rome, yet his successor, Caligula, banished him to Vienne in Gaul, where he was reduced to such extremity that he killed himself with his

own hands." Now whilst there cannot be found in any Roman edict or law any express injunction against the exercise of judicial powers by Procurators in criminal matters, it is reasonably certain that its exercise by that class of inferior officers was derogatory to the general political economy of the Empire, was without the authority of any positive edict or law, and was offensive to the Emperor at Rome. And the effect of all the fragments of testimony extant very clearly is that Pilate did not legally possess the judicial power he pretended to exercise in the case of Jesus Christ. His superior, the Governor General and Pro-Consul at Antioch, was the sole and only judge in that jurisdiction, and the sole and only officer who was authorized to try him.

II. "Whether Pilate, had he been a judge, was authorized by the Roman law he pretended to administer, to try the Saviour for treason without the presence and aid of a jury of Assessors."

It is reasonably certain that he was not. Although nothing like our common law trials by a jury of twelve had then been invented in any part of Europe, a necessity had developed itself in the Roman Empire for having a judicial appendage in the nature both of associate magisters, learned in the law, and of a jury to find the facts. It appears from various passages in ancient history that that appendage belonged to the judicial economy of the outlying provinces, and that the persons who served in that capacity were styled Assessors. Whilst it is very evident that Pilate and his successor, Felix, ignored that provision in the provincial jurisprudence and presumed to try what they held to be criminal cases without Assessors, it is quite as evident from St. Luke's relation of the arrest and arraignment of St. Paul, that Festus observed it. So many of the Procurators had been removed from their offices in Judæa and in other small provinces for misfeasance and malefeasance that Festus deemed it best to summon Assessors to sit and deliberate with him in the case of St. Paul at Cesarea.¹ And the

¹ The word "council" in Acts xxv.12, is defined to mean "principal persons who attended his court," by Dr. Scott, and "assessors" by Howson and Conybeare. See *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. II, p. 291. They relate "that Festus took his seat on the judicial tribunal with his assessors near him and ordered Paul to be brought before him," p. 291, and "that Festus took counsel with his assessors concerning the admissibility of Paul's appeal," p. 293.

account of his doing so is evidence to the mind of a modern civilian or lawyer that Pilate ought to have summoned Assessors to sit and advise with him in the case of the Saviour. Indeed, the account of the trial and the account of his summary removal from office after that trial taken together are conclusive that he had no authority to proceed as a judge without them.¹

III. "Whether Pilate was authorized by the Roman law, without first having been thereunto authorized by the Governor General of Syria, to inflict the death penalty."

Beyond all reasonable doubts he was not. The Roman Laws of that period confided to no officer below the rank of a Pro-Consul that terrible power. It is true that inferior officers were permitted if they were not expressly authorized to enforce their judgments concerning the rights of persons to property and privileges, without being specially authorized by the superiors above them. But after diligent search I have been unable to find the vestige of any edict or law which conferred upon them the power to execute and issue a death-warrant. Pilate either failed to comprehend his inferior and limited powers or was wilfully undutiful and defiant to the superior above him. Ignoring the right of the Governor General of Syria to sign and issue the death-warrant if one were to be signed and issued at all, he signed and issued it himself and wickedly and brutally supervised its execution.² And then after ignoring the Governor General in respect to the death-warrant and its execution he further ignored him in making his report. Instead of making his report of his proceedings to the Governor General as he should have done as a dutiful subordinate officer, it appears from all the published accounts that he made it directly to the Emperor. His utter disregard of all the rules of

¹ In a recent discourse by the Rev. Dr. Gottheil, a learned Rabbi of the city of New York, there is a virtual admission that the forms of that procedure were irregular, notwithstanding the averment coupled with it that "indictment, trial and sentence are no evidence of persecution."

² An ancient parchment purporting to have been the death-warrant of Jesus, the Christ, bearing the signature of Pontius Pilate, said to have been found a century or more ago among the documents of the Cæsars, is reported to be sacredly preserved in the archives of the Vatican at Rome.

official propriety was quite as striking as his previous disregard of the Roman Law.

It follows from all these well accredited representations of the Law and the Facts that each and every query must be answered in the negative. The Saviour was, as we all know, guilty of no treason to the Roman government; but it is nevertheless true that he was charged with it. Treason in all ages and countries has been a capital offence and traitors held to be proper subjects for capital punishment. Throughout Christendom, by decrees or enactments, the jurisdiction to try men for capital offences has been invariably conferred upon superior and not upon inferior tribunals. The best that any apologist for the Crucifixion can say of Pilate's Court is that it was an inferior tribunal, in an inferior province, subject to the superior government of the Pro-Consul at Antioch. As the power to preside in a superior tribunal was never conferred upon him by commission, edict or enactment of the Roman Senate, it follows that he usurped the power he exercised as a superior judge. His act of trying the Saviour at all was *usurpation*; his act of trying him without Assessors was *usurpation*; and his act of signing the death-warrant was *usurpation* also. He tried, convicted, sentenced and executed Jesus of Nazareth without sufficient judicial authority, and deserved the disgrace and the punishment which befell him.

BENJ. F. HALL.

POLITICAL RAPACITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

In connection with the struggle now going on in Germany between Church and State the argument has been brought forward by the opponents of the Church that the past history of the Papacy is the only fair illustration of its character, and that that character is as it always has been one of unsparing political rapacity.

The advocates of the Church of Rome on the other hand allege with some show of plausibility that the conduct of the Popes from five to eight hundred years ago was determined by circumstances to which later ages have furnished no parallel, and that therefore all apprehension as to any renewal of mediæval pretensions is groundless; that encroachment on the civil power is not of the essence of the Church's character.

Not a few Protestants in England and the United States are duped by this statement and consider that it is fanatical to attempt to restrict the political aggrandisement of the Church of Rome.

In view of the fact that this Church is making rapid advances in the acquisition of political influence in our own land, we commend to the careful consideration of our fellow citizens the inquiry whereto these things are tending. A correct judgment will best be obtained by comparing the conduct of the Papacy during the present century with that which it exhibited in those periods when its claims were the most extravagant. In the present paper we propose to review the foreign policy of the Church of Rome at and about the period of 1815.

Certainly if at any time we have had or shall have reason to expect the servant of the servants of God to exhibit the mildness and generosity of his character it should have been then when the

Church had been well-nigh overwhelmed with ruin, and when it was indebted to the civil authorities of Europe for the means of continuing its work and securing its welfare.

Again, if at any period of its existence the Papacy has displayed a demeanor intolerably overbearing and overreaching it was during the Pontificate of Gregory VII.

Comparing the Papal acts of these periods together we shall find that they exhibit a spirit essentially identical.

Just eight hundred years have elapsed since Gregory issued his famous Bull on the subject of lay investiture. Up to this time it had been customary for the bishops on their consecration to receive from the temporal authority a ring and a staff which symbolized the right to the enjoyment and control of the temporal possessions pertaining to the See. The ring was emblematic of the spiritual marriage of the bishop to his diocese, while the staff represented his authority within the limits of his jurisdiction. In order to appreciate the full import of this ceremony we must remember that all temporal authority of whatever description was held, under the feudal system, to emanate from the sovereign. Throughout Europe the feudal system was in force. According to its principles the entire lands of every country were regarded as the property of the sovereign. The great lords and barons and other proprietors of land held their possessions on condition of rendering certain services to him as their liege lord. Ecclesiastical officers equally with lay proprietors enjoyed their fiefs on military tenure.

This fact appears with marked prominence in German history. Prince-Archbishops and Prince-Bishops abound, exercising not simply the rights of ecclesiastical officers, but the powers of secular lords. They assume the leadership of the soldiers furnished by the district over which they have jurisdiction. In relation to the sovereign they were vassals. Gregory VII was clear-sighted enough to discern the influence of this in subordinating the ecclesiastical officer to the authority of the crown. Accordingly in the year 1075 he summoned a council at Rome and published an edict peremptorily forbidding churchmen hereafter to recognize any right of lay investiture. It was true the State made no claim to confer the spiritual function. It expressly limited its right to the temporal advantages belonging to the endowment, and

whatever it exacted in the way of recompense or service was distinctly affirmed to be a return for such temporal advantages.

Nevertheless it did not suit the views of the ambitious Pontiff that even to this limited extent the Church should be subordinate to the State. He enacted that "if hereafter any person should receive bishopric or abbacy from the hand of any layman he should no longer be numbered among the bishops or abbots." "Moreover we interdict him from the favor of the blessed St. Peter and from entrance into the Church until he shall have abandoned the position" (so conferred). "In like manner if any Emperor, duke, marquis, count or any secular authority or person shall have presumed to confer the investiture of a bishopric or any other ecclesiastical dignity, let him understand that he is bound by the chain of the same sentence."

It is impossible to conceive of presumption surpassing that which inspired this decree or to imagine a more absolute disregard of the rights of sovereigns than Gregory exhibited. It is easy to see what was the necessary consequence of this Bull. It affected profoundly the relations of every sovereign to a considerable and very influential proportion of his great vassals. It was a declaration of war upon the State by the Church. Most of the great prelates and abbots were at the same time princes, nobles and counsellors in the diets and other national assemblies. This decree of the Pope absolved them from their allegiance to the crown in case the sovereign should exercise what was simply his rights as liege lord of the country which he ruled. Excommunication was the penalty of disobedience to the Bull, and such disobedience was absolutely unavoidable under the existing system of feudal tenure.

What now, in the shape of justification for such a course on the part of Gregory, can be discovered in the then condition of Germany? It is to be admitted that the intervention of the popes in foreign political affairs in early and mediæval European history was not unfrequently matter of moral necessity. The papal authority constituted for those periods the High Court of International Arbitration. And not seldom the Pontiffs stood forth as the solitary champions of right and justice.

However adverse we may be to the encroachments of the papacy

we cannot but make ample allowance for their interference, nay, in many cases we must admire it. A moral necessity may rightfully supersede a statutory enactment. Every one will remember the story of the raising of the obelisk in the Piazza di San Pietro in 1586. Its removal was regarded as a very solemn affair. High mass was read and after this the Pope Sixtus V. gave orders that none should utter a word under pain of death during the raising of the obelisk. The immense mass is slowly rising upon its base when suddenly motion ceases. The ropes are giving way. The breathless silence which has thus far prevailed is broken. A sailor among the multitude cries out "*Acqua alle fani!*" "Water on the ropes," and this advice being acted upon the monster is drawn by the shrinkage of the ropes until it stands erect on its base. The honored man in that vast assemblage is the violator of the sovereign edict. Just so in the case of the popes themselves, moral necessity must often be allowed to have more than justified their interference in the domestic policy of foreign governments.

For Hildebrand, however, in the instance allowed to, no such plea can be urged. True, the subjects of Henry held him in no extravagant esteem. His immoralities are gross and notorious, and probably want of a conciliatory spirit rendered him obnoxious to the petty princes of Germany. Certain it is that at an early period of his reign he was met by powerful opposition in Saxony. The leaders of this revolt were seven bishops and archbishops, and the simple fact that they make no appeal to Rome shows abundantly that they were not reduced to any such straits as might have warranted Papal interference. Like Saxony, Thuringia also revolted and such was the power of the malecontents that Henry was forced to betake himself to flight and concealment. Whatever, therefore, may have been the grievances of his subjects the emperor was not so circumstanced as to defy their power. They were actually more than a match for him. The only necessity that existed so far as the papacy was concerned was the necessity for the Church of Rome to be true to her character as a political usurper.

If now we turn to the more recent period alluded to we shall find that lapse of time produces no change in Rome; that her

latest rulers like her earliest master have been nurtured by the dugs of the insatiable she-wolf.

In an instructive and interesting pamphlet the German historical writer Von Sybel has brought to the notice of his countrymen the efforts of the papacy to secure political supremacy in foreign countries during this century. Expressing our large obligations to his work we proceed to present the same theme for the sober consideration of our fellow citizens.

In order to appreciate the conduct of generous and grateful Mother Church at the period alluded to it will be needful briefly to recall the situation of European affairs in 1815. With volcanic force the French Revolution had upheaved and disorganized the institutions of France and the contagion of political disquietude had spread to every portion of Europe. Following upon this had occurred the Napoleonic devastations. In the stormy period occupied by these events the worldly comfort of millions of men had been destroyed. Hence there resulted a not unnatural disposition to look to religion for consolation. A violent reactionary movement everywhere prevailed. Particularly in France, where animosity to the Romish hierarchy had been productive of the most radical and blasphemous changes, where, regarding the fundamental principles of truth the boast had been made "*nous avons changé tout cela*," the people returned with more than eagerness to their first love. True, when Napoleon made the Roman Catholic religion once more the religion of the State by the Concordat of 1802 he found not a little dissatisfaction on the part of those who were immediately about him. On Easter-day following the signing of the Concordat a solemn Te Deum was held by Cardinal Caprara in commemoration of the re-establishment of Catholicism. After the performance Napoleon asked General Delmas how he was pleased. "Oh," he replied, "a very pretty Capucinade. We must now, I suppose, fasten beads to our swords." Marshal Lannes, seeing Caprara and a number of bishops at the Tuilleries, asked Napoleon to drive off "*cette canaille*," and inquired whether it was with soldiers of that kind that he had gained the battle of Marengo. No doubt there were numbers in France who sympathized with Delmas and Lannes. But the multitude thought very differently. Ultramontanism sprang up and was rampant where altars had been raised to the Goddess of

Reason and the Supreme Being had been sneeringly styled *Monsieur Etre*.

Another thing beside the loss of temporal possessions added strength to the reactionary feeling and powerfully drew all classes toward Rome. In the twenty years preceding 1815 monarchs had been robbed of their crowns, nobles had been shorn of hereditary privileges, the people had been made to understand that they were created to be food for powder and imperial ambition; all Europe had been contemplated, so to speak, on the Napoleocentric theory; everything had its existence solely for the carrying out of his schemes. After the subjugation of Genoa, Lebrun was made its governor. The emperor considered him too considerate of the feelings of the Genoese. He writes: "In uniting Genoa to the Empire I had but one object in view, viz.: 15,000 seamen. You are too mild, too merciful. I tell you that in matters of government justice means force as well as virtue. As to the discontent of the Genoese I am not the man to listen to such remonstrances. My answer is seamen, seamen—still seamen." The 15,000 Genoese seamen were intended to swell the French navy so as to render feasible a descent upon the English coast. The imperative urgency and heartless calculation of Napoleon in this case serve only as an illustration of his uniform and undeviating course.

Then again the sacred person of His Holiness had not escaped. Pius VII had been treated as a puppet, made prisoner, carried into France. Napoleon in the Schönbrunn decree had announced that the temporal power of the papacy was at an end. The "Little Corporal" had determined that as in the seventy years' captivity at Avignon so henceforth France should have supreme control in things ecclesiastical. The States of the Church had in fact been made a sort of appanage to the Empire. Europe, therefore, on the one hand, and the Pope on the other, had bonds of sympathy which drew them closely together. Both had been sufferers together. When, therefore, the moment of reorganization arrived the Pope looked to Europe for the restoration of his lost glory and the undoing of the tyrant's work, Europe looked to the papal power as the great bulwark of conservatism, the prop of social and political stability. Roman Catholicism seemed the grand antidote for reaction and revolution.

It is here, no doubt, that we are to find the explanation of the noteworthy fact that in the determination to reinstate the papacy and its hierarchy in 1814 there was entire unanimity without regard to difference of nationality or diversity of creed. The heretical powers, England, Russia and Prussia, were more anxious on the subject than Austria, who would gladly have reserved for herself a goodly slice of the papal domain, consisting of Ancona and Bologna. The various powers concerned in the work of reorganization had evidently not the smallest idea that the papacy would ever reassert its mediæval pretensions. Hence Pius VII resumed his position at Rome not only without opposition but amid the congratulations of all Europe.

It becomes appropriate now to observe how he responded to the generous confidence thus manifested toward him. The pontiff was not devoid of amiable qualities. He was, however, lacking in force of character and as regarded education he was an adept neither in theology nor in canonical jurisprudence. It is not, therefore, marvelous to learn that he was wholly dependent on his advisers and particularly upon the celebrated Gonsalvi. In him Pius had unbounded confidence. Gonsalvi was a man of consummate worldly wisdom and executive ability, well skilled in those wiles of diplomacy which are supposed to become the astute man of the world rather than the heavenly-minded ecclesiastic, but which have been found by the latter at times expedient if not indispensable. He was ever ready to exhibit apostolic humility in things insignificant, while in such as he deemed essential he was absolutely unyielding. The diplomatic qualities of Gonsalvi were eminently serviceable to the papacy in that period of the reign of Pius VII which was anterior to the downfall of Napoleon. The self-made emperor demanded a large share of respect. We find in the Concordat of 1802, which restored Roman Catholicism, greater privileges in regard to ecclesiastical affairs conceded to him without any demurring than those which are now claimed for the State by those recent laws of the German Empire which are so diabolically mischievous in the eyes of *Pio Nono*. Nay, more, when his imperial majesty assumed to exercise still greater powers his assumptions were allowed to pass without notice. Only when he desired from the Court of Rome an explicit recognition

of freedom in creed and worship was he thwarted. Even then, however, the cardinal remained the diplomat. He simply threw himself upon the essential character of the Church. As its representative he insisted that the Church of Rome is essentially incapable of toleration, and that she is bound to reject freedom of faith as inherently godless, that while she cannot compel the emperor to take action against heretics she would be signing her own death-warrant were she to recognize heresy as justifiable. The papacy will do for the emperor all that it can. Its complaisance will be checked only by insuperable obstacles. Pius and his wily counsellor had noted an instructive portion of the history of their times. They had observed the hitherto unknown Napoleon placed by the French Directory in 1796 at the head of the National forces in Italy. Through previous mismanagement the troops are in utter destitution. Shoeless and in rags they are on the verge of demoralization. With this skeleton of an army in less than a month Napoleon gains six victories over the Austrians and Piedmontese; he takes twenty-one standards, fifty guns and several strongholds; he conquers the richest part of Piedmont, makes 15,000 prisoners, and kills or wounds 10,000 men. He has done more in a few days than preceding generals in four campaigns. Austria is reduced to inaction, Sardinia to submission. It was an edifying spectacle. It hardly required infallibility to interpret the parable. For a man whose genius could as by magic transform demoralization into power the Court of Rome could not but entertain profound respect, and if in the regions subject to his control any irregularities in matters ecclesiastical took place it was a convenient thing to wink at them, or at the most to attempt their rectification by diplomatic persuasion of the mildest kind. Not many years, however, elapse, and there accurs a dwarfing of the power of Napoleon. The wintry sky of 1812 is reddened with the suicidal flames of Moscow. The blazing city is the funeral pyre of Napoleon's greatness. True, the extraordinary genius of the conqueror does enable him for a time to rise superior to the overwhelming calamities of the Russian campaign; but the victories of Leutzen, Bantzen and Dresden are speedily followed by the overthrow at Leipsig. Doubtless at this conjuncture Pius VII is found offering the sympathy of the holy Mother Church to

the downfallen victor. The Pontiff and his astute companion discover a gleam of light amid the gloom. They see that the moment is at hand when it will be possible to assume a more dignified air than has been altogether convenient during the domination of Napoleon. Leipsig is lost in October, 1813, the allies enter Paris on the last day of March, 1814, and Pius VII on the 5th of May has the happiness of addressing the faithful once more from the soil of Italy. The tone of his proclamation is prophetic. Styling himself "God's vicar upon earth," he informs the world that although he cannot at this moment exercise all the ancient powers of the Holy See he doubts not that in no long time he will recover them. Ten days elapse and another proclamation issues from Rome itself. His Holiness declares that the Code Napoleon is abolished, the former pontifical civil code is once again the law of Rome. All measures of reform introduced by the French were at once discontinued, even when such measures were obviously valuable. Although they were necessarily a heavy burden upon the papal treasury nevertheless the 2,400 cloisters of the olden times were restored and endowed. The system of education was placed once more completely under the direction of the priesthood, notwithstanding the fact that under their management no less than ninety per cent. of the population had been suffered to grow up without a knowledge of reading and writing; the offices of state were filled exclusively by ecclesiastics despite the fact that under priestly rule public safety had been a thing unknown, and the government had been reduced to the humiliating necessity of carrying on negotiations and making formal treaties with the banditti, just as though the latter formed a sovereign power.

In August, 1814, about three months after the return of the Pope to Rome, a momentous step is taken. That step is one which must be regarded as a fair indication of the essential character of the papacy. It demonstrates what the Holy See will do when it has unlimited control. Most emphatically does it prove that if moderation is exhibited and arrogant claims are not put forth this arises from no intrinsic merit but solely from external restraint. On the 17th of August the Society of the Jesuits, that order which during its entire existence has had the one constant aim of subjecting the world to the supremacy of the pope, was

authorized once more to begin its insidious attacks upon the civil rights and liberties of mankind. After the body had been expelled from France and Spain in compliance with the explicit demands of the governments of those countries, they found refuge in Russia and there secured so far the good-will of the emperor that at his instance the pope restored the Order so far as Russia was concerned and took it under his special protection. In like manner the King of the Two Sicilies was by a papal brief favored with the re-establishment of this extraordinary engine of ecclesiastical despotism in his domains.

In the Bull of August the 17th His Holiness states that the entire "Catholic world demands with unanimous voice the re-establishment of the company of Jesus." If the affirmations of the Bull are correct, and we have no reason to suppose them otherwise, they seem to indicate that the Roman Catholic Church of the nineteenth century is heart and soul Jesuitical. For, says the Pontiff :

We daily receive the most pressing petitions from our venerable brethren, the archbishops and bishops and most distinguished persons (requesting the restoration). We should deem ourselves guilty of a great crime toward God if placed in the bark of St. Peter, tossed and assailed by continual storms, we refused to employ the vigorous and experienced powers who volunteer their services in order to break the waves of a sea which every moment threatens shipwreck and death. We have decided to do now what we could have wished to do at the commencement of our pontificate. After having by fervent prayers implored the Divine assistance, after having taken the advice and counsel of a great number of our venerable brothers, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, we have decreed in virtue of the plenitude of Apostolic power and with perpetual validity that all the concessions and powers granted by us to the Russian Empire and the kingdom of the Two Sicilies shall henceforth extend to all other States. We take under our immediate tutelage and that of the Holy See all the colleges, houses, provinces and members of this Order.

We ordain that the present letters be inviolably observed, declaring null and void any encroachment on the present regulations (made) either knowingly or from ignorance; and this notwithstanding any apostolical constitutions and ordinances especially the brief of Clement XIV of happy memory, beginning with the words Dominus ac Redemptor, issued under the seal of the Fisherman, on the 22d of July, 1773, which we expressly abrogate as far as contrary to the present order.

Should any one take upon himself to attempt to infringe or oppose any part of this ordinance let him know that he will thereby incur the indignation of Almighty God and of the Holy Apostles, Peter and Paul.

Those who conceive that the Romish Church is merely a branch

of the universal Church and not also and pre-eminently an avaricious political power will do well to reflect on the representations made by the bishops of France at the period of the expulsion of the Jesuits from that kingdom. In the despatch of the Duke de Choiseul to the French Ambassador at Rome the statement is made that fifty-one bishops had met in conference to consider the question of the influence of the Jesuits in France. Only six dissenting it had been resolved after a profound examination of the Constitution of the Order that the unlimited authority of a general at Rome was incompatible with the laws of the kingdom. It was urged by Choiseul that a superior should be allowed to reside at the Court of France.

The answer of the Jesuits to this and the accompanying suggestions for reform is said to have been "*Sint ut sunt aut non sint.*" "Let them be as they are or let them not be." Whether these were the words employed or not the spirit in which the suggestions of Choiseul were received is not misrepresented by them. No change was admitted and the Jesuits were expelled as a body dangerous to the civil power of France.

In Spain two years later Charles III without even consulting the pope banished the Jesuits and announced the event to His Holiness as an accomplished fact. The edict of suppression prohibited any Jesuit from re-entering the dominions of Spain under any pretext whatever; it interdicted him from all correspondence with that country. "On the 2d of April, 1767, on the same day and at the same hour in Spain itself, in North and South Africa, in Asia and in America and in all the islands of the Spanish monarchy the alcaldes of the towns opened the dispatches they had received from Madrid. The tenor of all was the same; the alcaldes were enjoined (under pain, it is said, of death) immediately to enter the establishments of the Jesuits armed to take possession of them, to expel the Jesuits, and transport them within twenty-four hours as prisoners to such port as was mentioned. Their papers were to be left under seal, they were to carry with them only a breviary, a purse and their apparel. From Spain itself about 6,000 were taken by ship and the attempt was made to land them at Civita Vecchia. They were received with cannon shot. The pope had given orders that they should not be landed. The

Spanish commander sailed to Leghorn and Genoa. They were peremptorily refused permission to land. They were kept wandering about for a period of six months when, worn out by fatigue and decimated by disease, they were allowed to find a miserable asylum upon the island of Corsica.

What could it imply that this Society should be driven not from Protestant countries merely but from those which were devotedly loyal to the papacy? What does it mean that Clement XIII is urged by the French Government to modify the Jesuit Constitution? Why is Clement XIV by the representations of Roman Catholic governments compelled to put forth the Brief of Suppression in 1773? No reader of history needs to be told that the perpetual interference of the Society with the social and governmental institutions of the countries in question was that which rendered its continued existence insupportable.

And again, need any person of intelligence be told what is implied when in 1814 Pius VII immediately on his return to Rome put forth a decree re-establishing the Order, taking it under the special tutelage of himself and his successors? The theological and moral views of the Church of Rome are not changeable. What a momentous lesson then do the citizens of every free and enlightened country learn from the fact that Pius in his Brief declares that he should deem himself guilty of a great crime toward God if he were to refuse to re-establish the Jesuits?

In 1814 met the Vienna Congress—an assembly whose purpose was to settle on a valid and permanent basis the affairs of Europe after the devastations of Napoleon. Pius VII was represented by Gonsalvi.

What was the action of the supreme pontiff? The papacy entered a protest against everything that had occurred since 1789 to modify the political and religious institutions of Europe. The statesmen composing the congress allowed themselves to be deluded with the idea that this action of His Holiness meant nothing, only that it was the habit of the papal government to insist rigidly upon principles savoring strongly of ecclesiastical absolutism, while in practice they granted the faithful no inconsiderable latitude. Gonsalvi frequently used the expression—"Grant us the principle. act afterwards as you please, we shall take no notice of unavoid-

able irregularities." Pius VII himself was accustomed to say that "one must have regard to the circumstances of the times, the heretics in Europe are strong." It was thus a settled maxim of papal statecraft to hold the principle in reserve and assume, under the necessity of circumstances, an attitude of liberality, but to enforce such principle in all its rigidity whenever circumstances allowed.

In order fully to appreciate the significance of the papal policy at the period under consideration we must remember that Gonsalvi belonged to the so-called "moderate" school in the College of Cardinals. His opponents disliked his half measures exceedingly. They indicated lukewarmness. But an examination of the negotiations carried on by Gonsalvi with certain of the powers of Europe regarding the re-establishment of the Church will serve amply to exculpate him from the charge of liberality, and to show that like the prudent huntsman he merely took care that his game was in range before he used his ammunition.

Particularly instructive are Gonsalvi's negotiations with Germany. The condition of the Church in this country in 1814 was no better than elsewhere. The ecclesiastical organization was in utter disorder. Church property confiscated, the cloisters abolished, the greatest want of clergy everywhere prevailed. In this state of affairs the rulers themselves saw that the re-establishment of the Church under some form or other was a political necessity. Naturally enough they turned to the papacy as the formerly prevalent system and as now specially commending itself to the communities of Europe by Gonsalvi's apparent moderation.

The overtures of the German princes were particularly gratifying to Pius. They had already given His Holiness reason to expect that their views in regard to the re-establishment of the Church would harmonize with his own. At this time a very considerable portion of the German ecclesiastics, headed by Wessenberg, Vicar of Constance, entertained the project of organizing a German National Church. A proposition to carry this plan into execution was actually brought forward in the Vienna Congress. The German princes dreaded any such concentration of ecclesiastical power, as likely to prepare the way for concentration of political power, and for a consequent belittlement of their authority. In all likelihood the primate of any national church organization

would be an Austrian, and in virtue of his position would needs exercise control in the domestic affairs of Bavaria, Prussia, etc. Each of the petty principalities therefore, determined to have its own independent provincial church. Accordingly in 1815 Bavaria opened negotiations with the Court of Rome in reference to this matter.

These negotiations illustrate very clearly the intrinsic character of the Church of Rome at the time alluded to. They show that the gentle suavity of Pius and Gonsalvi was only a temporary stratagem.

The claw now emerges from its cushion. All the demands of former days, asserted by the modern Romish apologists to belong to the irrevocable past, were with the utmost strenuousness insisted upon. Protestants, who at that time constituted one third of the entire population of Bavaria, must be driven from the country; all claim that any species of supremacy or supervision over the Church belonged to the State must be unreservedly renounced; the schools and the press must be subjected to the control of the bishops; the authority of the canon law must be unconditionally recognized. These points were contested for a period of two years. At length Count Rechberg, who was the Bavarian Minister of Foreign Affairs, showed himself more than a match for his wily antagonist. He recollected hearing a papal nuncio, della Genga by name, make the statement that if only the principles insisted on by the Court of Rome were conceded, His Holiness "closed one eye as far as actual practice was concerned." He determined to employ the papal diplomacy himself. He would indulge his Holiness so far as to allow in a Concordat the setting forth of the darling principle of the supreme authority of the Canon Law, while it should at the same time be silently understood on the part of Bavaria that the civil power was and should remain unconditionally supreme. Accordingly the Concordat was drawn up in 1817. The king secured his wish in the establishment of eight pure Bavarian bishoprics whose bishops he named and whose pastors he appointed without the intervention of any Austrian primate or National German Church. Pius on his part had the gratification of placing in the Concordat the stipulation that the Canon Law should be in force throughout Bavaria.

What does Canon Law mean? It contains the following articles: 1st. That heretics shall be extirpated. 2d. That the clergy shall be free from taxation, and in general from civil jurisdiction. 3d. That the king, the government and the laws of the State shall be subjected to the supervision of the Pope. It would not have been judicious to require the explicit statement of all this—but the principle involving all these details was secured.

At Rome there was great rejoicing over this apparently successful attempt furtively to establish the civil supremacy of the Pope in Bavaria. The pious king was duly belauded. But a cloud soon overshadowed the lustre of Rome's joy. Perhaps through the diplomatic skill of Rechberg, perhaps through their own excessive zeal, the representatives of the Court of Rome had proposed as an article of the Concordat that the authority of the Canon Law should be promulgated as a State law. This was a checkmate for the papacy. Count Rechberg and his government ingeniously drew a conclusion from this which altogether nullified the diplomacy of the Curia. If the edict that Canon Law is of force in Bavaria be a State law, then obviously the authority of the said Canon Law is derived from the civil power which alone makes State laws. A new constitution was framed for Bavaria. In it was expressly given a guarantee on the part of the State for entire religious freedom and equal recognition of both Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches. A special edict bearing on the subject of religion was put forth as a sort of supplement to the constitution. In this were asserted the supervision of the king over the secular and civil relations of the Church and the right of appeal to the king from the abuse of ecclesiastical power. This supplement closed with the statement that all affairs of the Roman Catholic Church unprovided for by this enactment were regulated by the accompanying royal declaration. The Concordat, in other words declaring itself a State law, was interpreted by the constitution as such, and like every other State law was limited in its meaning and force by the principles of the constitution. These were affirmed to be universally paramount.

At Rome there arose no small grief. The Pope and Cardinals, like Rachel of old, refused to be comforted. To grief was added indignation. Pius might be compared to a wild bull in a net. His

frantic endeavors to get out of its meshes were of no avail. The Bavarian government had gained the day and the results of its victory are enjoyed at the present moment. No ecclesiastic can in that country assume the office of parish priest, prebend or bishop without the express approval of the civil authority. As in feudal times, in direct contravention of the Canon Laws of Hildebrand, lay-investiture is thus the recognized practice of the country. What in Prussia the adherents of the clerical party are denouncing as remorseless persecution of the Church and the abrogation of divine law has been for fifty years, with the knowledge and connivance of the Pope, the existing state of things in Bavaria. The laws of the land have been paramount over the canons of the Church. At the same time the struggle now raging in Germany shows how repugnant such a condition of things must have ever been to the Curia. It is evidently simply a case in which prudence has been deemed the better part of valor and the enormity has been winked at because the assertion and maintenance of the supremacy of canon law only have been and are in abeyance.

The course pursued with Bavaria was followed by the papacy in its negotiation with the other German states. Repeatedly Gonsalvi announced that no arrangements regarding the reorganization of the churches could be made unless the general relation of Church and State should be explicitly determined by a Concordat. What kind of a Concordat would meet the pious wishes of the papacy may be clearly and very instructively learned from the prescription of Gonsalvi himself. This is contained in a note bearing date September 2, 1817, addressed to the Hanoverian government. In explicit terms Gonsalvi insists that rightfully the State has no supervision over the Church, that a non-Catholic sovereign can properly have no share in the nomination of Catholic bishops and priests; nor have any voice in regard to the training and education of the Catholic clergy; that ecclesiastics should be free from all civil jurisdiction; that it should not be stated that the different confessions were entitled to equal civil rights; finally, that the Catholic Church must ever regard heretics, however far they may have strayed from the fold, as sheep of the flock committed to her care. No reserve marked the style of Gonsalvi in

this prescription. It was composed amid the elation felt at Rome on the drawing up of the Concordats with France and Bavaria. But a change came over the spirit of Gonsalvi's dream. The French Concordat was cancelled, and that concluded with Bavaria was interpreted in such a manner by the Bavarian government that its value as an instrument of papal aggression was wholly destroyed. It became appropriate to employ a milder tone in the communications of the Curia. There was some reason to apprehend that the breathings of independence might grow to a blast. Accordingly irreconcilable principles were temporarily waived and the papacy contented itself with arranging such practical matters as the establishment of bishoprics and the determination of their respective jurisdictions and, what was a point of extreme importance, the pecuniary maintenance of such offices by the several governments. A Bull was issued by his Holiness allowing the necessary work of organization to proceed and this was published in several of the prominent governments of Germany as a State enactment. At the same time it is a noteworthy evidence of the suspicion entertained by these governments toward the Holy See that the publication of the document was accompanied notably in the case of Prussia, Baden, both the Hesses and Hanover, with express reservation of all rights of supremacy and supervision over the Church anciently belonging to the civil government. No doubt in every instance it has been expected that when the opportunity should present itself the bishops should take pains to nullify these provisos and bring about the supremacy of the Canon Law. But nevertheless the result of what was done by the governments in question has been that during an entire generation, in spite of the Canon Law, everywhere in Germany the civil equality of the two confessions, the control of the schools by the State, the freedom of literature from ecclesiastical censorship, a strong if not a determining influence of the State in the selection of bishops and other ecclesiastical officers, have been recognized facts.

It is of special interest to examine somewhat in detail the course of the papal negotiations with Prussia. At Berlin two opposing lines of policy were pressed upon the government. The one was identical with that pursued by Frederick the Great, who maintained with uncompromising rigor the absolute supremacy of the

State in ecclesiastical affairs. Its adherents held that if in their present emergency it was unavoidable to allow Rome a share in the management of the National Church, yet that her movements must be watched with the keenest suspicion. Other Prussian statesmen took a different and what might perhaps be characterized as a more generous view. While they did not for a moment propose the surrender of any civil right in regard to the Church, they felt that the political necessities of Europe required all legitimate sovereigns to respect and succor the Pope as are representative of conservatism. Among those who advocated this view was the historian Niebuhr. Trusting and guileless himself, he was incapable of appreciating the duplicity of papal diplomacy. Happily for the country his views were not adopted by the government. Fifteen years of vacillation ensued, during which no decisive agreement with the Curia was made. This of itself, while it shows the determination of at least a large proportion of the Prussian people to resist papal encroachment, shows also the determination of the Pope to force upon Prussia such principles as would of necessity compromise the civil power. It is at length agreed at Berlin what terms to offer to his Holiness. The Pope is to establish the general limits of the bishoprics; to designate the chapters and parishes; the State will supply the funds necessary for the support of the Church provided the king is allowed a decisive influence in the nomination of the bishops.

The papacy is driven into a corner. To concede such a point will be perilous; to refuse the demand of Prussia will be equally hazardous. Gonsalvi writes that "His Holiness cannot possibly in the Bull confer such a privilege on a non-Catholic sovereign. He will, however, in a special brief, instruct the Prussian chapters that they choose no one as bishop regarding whom they have not received assurance that he is acceptable to the king." In the publication of the Bull the king expressly reserved to the crown all hitherto existing rights. These "rights" were nearly identical with those which were established by the laws of Napoleon on the left bank of the Rhine. They included the important provisos that unless with the approval of the sovereign no communication from the papal authorities should be received by a subject of the king, no resolution of any council should be published, no

gathering of bishops at all partaking the nature of a council for the purpose of discussing ecclesiastical matters should be held, no convent founded and even no congregation formed. The State claimed supervision over the seminaries of the priest. Every direct or indirect attack upon a confession of faith other than his own was prohibited under legal penalty to the preacher. In the Prussian governmental instructions of October 22, 1817, the right of civil supervision over the Church was distinctly set forth; in particular it was provided in the matter of secular education that no priest should exercise any oversight unless he were acting by virtue of a commission from the government.

Such was the relation of Church and State in Prussia when Niebuhr and Gonsalvi were carrying on the negotiations already alluded to. It is obvious that those negotiations would have had no object unless the relations of Church and State had been unsatisfactory to the Pope, and unless he entertained the hope of radically changing them. Only the fact that the ecclesiastical exchequer was empty induced his Holiness to make the required concessions. The Bull "*De salute animarum*" was, however, published. In its reserve it is easy to ascertain the feelings of the Pope. The rights demanded by the Prussian government are not expressly conceded or withheld. And yet on principles of ordinary fair dealing one would suppose that the papal government would have considered itself as accepting every one of the Prussian propositions. For there is no reserve regarding the proposed endowments of the bishoprics, canonries and parishes, endowments it is to be remembered which were offered by Prussia solely on condition that the rights of civil supervision over the Church which had so long been exercised within her dominions should not in the new negotiations undergo any modification. The supplies are all accepted with much the same complacency as was shown by the Israelites when they borrowed of the Egyptians jewels of gold and jewels of silver and raiment with very small idea of ever making any return of the same. And not only were the terms of Prussia in this sense and degree accepted, Rome even conformed her practice in the management of the Prussian Church to the principles insisted on by the government. For a period of twenty years in accordance with the Prussian law she allowed her

correspondence with the bishops to pass through the hands of the Prussian bureau of public worship. Not in vain had the diplomats of Pius VII perused the fables of the sirens and their luring strains. The entire Prussian people were being educated into a confidence in the Church of Rome which it was expected would in due time render facile any and every encroachment on the civil power. No one in Prussia during this long interval of nearly twenty years could have dreamt that the ecclesiastical status in that kingdom was at all distasteful to the authorities of the Church and least of all that the abrogation of that status would ever come to be regarded in the light of a religious duty. During the period alluded to no single protest was heard from the Church of Rome. And yet while the inner life of the Church, its articles of faith, its ritual, its pastoral management remained wholly unaffected by State control, its external relations have been determined by nothing else. The State assumed without dispute the right to exercise such control. This was the case from 1820 to 1840 and 1850 when the system of church management at present prevalent in Prussia was introduced. Some modifications of the previous system were adopted, but whatever these were they were made without any co-operation of the Church authorities. They were conceived by the statesmen of the country. They were promulgated through enactments of the civil government. It may with justice be asked with what shadow of propriety the right of the State can be questioned to modify afresh that system which it originated in 1850.

It is now the custom of the Roman Catholic clergy to designate the period from 1821 onward as a time of bondage for the Church. Facts, however, show that this is a pure misrepresentation. The churches were as much frequented as now; no lack was felt of benevolent associations. Educational work in all its grades produced if anything more splendid results than at present. It is true that ecclesiastical bickering found no place, and not a few inspired with more zeal than knowledge complained of this condition of tranquility and stigmatized it as indicative of lukewarmness and were wont to bewail the prevailing plague of indifferentism. But so far was the period alluded to from being in any sense a period of restricted liberty that on the contrary it was the

unvarying policy of the government to regard every positive form of religious faith as a bulwark of protection to the spirit of conservatism. Acting on this principle it accorded to the Roman Catholics as to the Protestants untrammelled freedom in all matters properly religious and disciplinary. As an illustration of the extent to which this principle was carried may be mentioned an event which occurred in Silesia. A Roman Catholic parochial priest took upon himself to read the mass in German. The Archbishop Schimonski proceeded against him, and the government at once endorsed him in the most emphatic manner. A document was issued from the bureau of public worship denouncing the innovators as demagogues and revolutionists and threatening them with the severest penalties. What further shows the relation of the government to the Church to have been certainly not subversive of or at all detrimental to the spirit of genuine piety is the well-known position of cordiality with the government maintained by such men as Count Spiegel, Archbishop of Cologne, a man of singular earnestness and elevation of character. No! had the Church desired for its worshippers an undisturbed and impressive religious ceremonial, had they wished simply to have an orthodox and well instructed parochial clergy, so that the legitimate work of the Church might be ably carried on, all this could have been secured without any of the changes in the relation of Church and State for which under the name of "religious freedom" they are now so clamorous. The freedom which they are anxious to secure is that which Gonsalvi asked in 1803 and 1817 from Bavaria and Hanover, freedom to extirpate or punish non-Catholics, freedom to bring up the youth of the country in blind intellectual dependence, freedom to destroy every book containing views adverse or unlike to their own, freedom to amass wealth to be used for the purpose of enlarging the political power of the Church.

From the foregoing recital it is evident that civil encroachment is not a thing which has been unavoidably forced upon the papacy by the pressure of extraordinary circumstances when as the recognized champion of right it was under the necessity of assuming extraordinary powers. In recent as in past times the unalterable aim of the Church of Rome has been the establishment of its unconditional supremacy, as in things ecclesiastical so in things

political. The circumstances of particular periods may be unfavorable for the full development of its plans and the enforcement of its principles. To quote Pius VII "the heretics may be strong." What then? Only this: that the papacy must wait. It loses its essential characteristics no more than the caged hyena. Remove the iron bars: the claws and the fangs will do their work. Only the lack of physical or moral strength prevents the Romish Church from being in the nineteenth century all that it was in the eleventh. Grant it power and opportunity in any clime and at any period and it will be what it was when Hildebrand, to quote his own language, "for the honor and defence of the Church in the name of Almighty God and by the power and authority of St Peter, interdicted King Henry from the government of the realm of Germany and Italy, absolved all Christians from the oaths which they had sworn or might swear to him and forbade all obedience to him as king."

The claims of the papacy then and now are absolutely identical.

MYTTON MAURY.

THE GENERAL CONVENTION AND THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD—1877.

The future church historian will begin a new chapter when he comes to A. D., 1877. He will have told of that death-like torpor exhibited by the Church in almost every feature during the early part of the present century. Then many pages will present the gladdening record of an awakened life, all within the memory of those just beginning to become old men. Churches and holy services restored; churches and missions for the benefit of the poor and the fallen; schools and sisterhoods, bishoprics founded all throughout the Colonial Empire of Great Britain, and missions extended in every direction. And this new aspect of life and vigor presented by the Mother Church in England the historian will say is impressed alike at the present day upon all the branches of the Anglican Communion. But those who turn over the leaves of this Church history of the future will find what has always been found—that in the case of all revivals some engaged therein will run to excess, and seem to hinder the progress of the Church's work. This sort of thing, to many a great trial, is plainly permitted and overruled to the greatest good. It seems as if it were needed that such portion of the Divine teaching and means of grace intrusted to the Church and required in Her Master's Service must be submitted to trial, brought to the "balance of the sanctuary," proved by the teaching of primitive times and the acknowledged Fathers of the Church. This has been going on for nearly half a century now. There have passed through this ordeal—the doctrine with regard to the distinctive position of the Church; the Divinely appointed order in the ministry; the grace

of Baptism; the Divine Presence and mode of that Presence in the Holy Eucharist; ritual and vestments; private confession and absolution. As the past thirty or forty years went by, men's minds have been agitated by controversy on each of the above named sacred subjects in their turn, and with reference to that last named subject, private confession, most of all. At no time during the period referred to did there exist so great alarm and such depth of feeling especially in the Mother Church as in the latter part of the present year.

And it was at this time and under these circumstances that the two great representative bodies of the Church in America were appointed to meet. To any ordinary observer and even to those trusting much to the Divine promises, there seemed to be before those assemblies a prospect of strong party feeling and much dissension.

The Provincial Synod met on the 12th of September, 1877, in Montreal. In the dioceses of Montreal, Huron and Ontario churchmanship has long been marked by what is well understood, without any unkind meaning, as ultra-Protestantism. This is not so in the other dioceses in the Dominion. From the maritime provinces there was a fair representation of both parties in the Church, but decidedly conservative.

At the opening of the Synod the Bishop of Fredericton preached the sermon. It has since been extensively published. The marked point in this admirable sermon was earnest exhortation in favor of love and toleration. This had special reference to that party which has taken an extreme position in teaching on ritual. There has been a time and that not remote, when such a sermon with all its depth of earnestness and true Christian spirit, would have caused great excitement and commotion. This was feared by many who held fully with the teaching of the learned and eloquent Prelate it being thought that more than before, controversy and party spirit would be aroused through the newspapers. But no such result followed. The press, with scarcely an exception, was silent, or spoke in terms of warm approval. Among the members of the Synod, the teaching and exhortations of the Bishop helped to the laying aside unhappy divisions.

Then the presence of the Bishop of Connecticut, his kind-

ness and courtesy, his eloquent address, all of a church-like yet practical character, tended greatly to foster feelings of good-will and acted, most happily, as a supplement to the warnings and exhortations of the Bishop of Fredericton.

Compared with the General Convention of the American Church, the Provincial Synod appears in limited proportions. The House of Bishops is composed of nine members, presided over by the Metropolitan, the Bishop of Montreal. The Lower House is well represented. It comprises the most influential of the clergy, and of the laity the most leading men of the various learned professions in the Dominion.

At the late session there was, fortunately for the Church, very little actual legislation. One important question was finally settled. This, more than any other, since the formation of the Synod, had aroused feeling and controversy. For several past sessions a canon with reference to the confirmation by the House of Bishops of a Bishop-elect had failed to secure the requisite majority in the Lower House. Nothing could have shown more clearly a change of feeling than the way in which this important question was introduced, discussed and finally adopted almost unanimously.

The canon provides for all that the Church seems to require. It prevents the possibility of the consecration of a Bishop-elect without the approval of a majority of the House of Bishops. The Church in the United States has placed, in such cases, an absolute veto in the House of Bishops, and requires the approval of a majority of the House of Deputies; or of the Standing Committees. In Canada the Church is content with its security under the sanction of the Bishops in admitting any addition to their number. If objections are raised, they must be assigned, and they must be definite and canonical. In all legislation it seems desirable to provide for every possible contingency, and it may be that, for centuries to come, the Canadian House of Bishops will not be called to give anything more than a formal approval in case of an addition to the Episcopate.

The purpose of this paper will not permit particulars regarding the several subjects which occupied the late meeting of the Provincial Synod. One marked feature may be alluded to—the strong

aversion to any changes in the Book of Common Prayer, or any variance from the practice, in this regard, of the Mother Church. It was this feeling which prevented the proposed introduction of prayers for special occasions from the American Prayer Book. By many it was thought this feeling was carried too far in the rejection, by the Lower House, of a canon for the admission to the Diaconate, under the approval of the Bishops, at the age of twenty-one.

A motion to reduce the number of representatives was lost. By the larger number it was said that different parties in the Church would be more fully represented. At the same time an idea seemed prevalent that representation should have more reference to the number of the members of the Church in the several dioceses rather than to the dioceses themselves. This is so clearly a matter of right that further action both in the Dominion and in the United States is only a question of time.

Among the most interesting matters before the Synod were the report of the Delegation to the American Church in 1874, and the reception of the delegates from that Church by the Synod. Nothing could exceed the cordiality exhibited in this reception, and the addresses by the Bishop of Connecticut and by the distinguished clergymen who accompanied him, were most warmly received.

There is one most important object with which the Church in Canada must be more specially and fully occupied. That is defined missionary work at home and abroad, under the management and control of the Synod. The Diocese of Algoma is indeed a missionary diocese. But its devoted Bishop and his formidable work are not sufficiently provided for. A committee has been appointed to secure improvement in this matter. When this is done more like work remains. The responsibility is laid upon the Church in Canada, by Her Great Head, and it rests upon the representative body. All time must not be consumed in making or changing canons or laws. Nothing better for the Synod than to constitute itself, for a good portion of its session, into a Board of Missions, and devise means whereby it may do its part in this vast domain and everywhere else in "preaching the gospel to every creature."

And is there not good reason for hope, with reference to this all-

important work, from the tone of feeling which marked the proceedings of the Synod from the beginning to the end? From avowedly different sections of the Church the representatives found, after all, that their differences were not so great as they imagined. With every thoughtful mind in one particular there was full accord. The maintenance of the doctrines and the teaching of the Church and the call for her extension as the great means of the salvation of mankind. On all points of difference of a minor character there was not throughout the meeting one harsh word. Nor was there a call for vote by orders. All this must help in aiming a death blow to that bitterness of party in the Church which has too long existed. Best of all, it was evident that the prayers of God's people had been heard and answered; that those godly admonitions at the opening of the Synod had not been offered in vain.

In addressing ourselves now to the more important portion of our subject we must claim for it, however imperfectly presented, a momentous character. It treats of the Church of Christ in her united action of what is doing and of what is likely to be done through this divine agency in coming ages all over this great continent. From the daily reports published by the "Churchman" the proceedings of the General Convention are generally known and widely extended. This precludes the need of minute particulars now. Our present purpose is to endeavor to exhibit, from what may be called an outside stand-point, the aspect of this great assembly—the nature and tone of its proceedings during the session of 1877.

Since the year 1868 the writer of this paper has, with the deepest interest, attended each successive meeting of the General Convention, and the correctness of the opinion he has ventured to express regarding the highest interests of the Church as involved in the proceedings of this great body, has been fully confirmed. Nor is there one particular in which the interested observer may not have marked a most salutary advance and improvement in comparing the proceedings of the late session with those of 1868. Nor is reference here intended so much to the large increase in the Episcopate and of the dioceses represented. Nine years ago, indeed to a later period, there existed strong party feeling in the Conven-

tion. A great portion of time was expended in discussions which had relation to diverse views and opinions regarding the teaching of the Church. On the part of both deputies and dioceses votes were given and recorded on strictly distinctive party lines. On the one hand serious alarm existed as to the course of the extreme High Church party, or of those known now as Ritualists. It was at one time even thought necessary to introduce a canon, which was wisely rejected, indicating the length of surplices and cassocks. There were also murmurs and misgivings with regard to the other extreme section. With a great deal of courtesy there was, at the time to which we refer, much avowed dissatisfaction and great want of confidence. All this has gradually passed away. Apart from direct influence through the Holy Spirit of truth and peace, we may venture to notice secondary causes which have conduced to this blessed change. There was the meeting together, the interchange of opinions, the acting together in the furtherance of the Church's work, but most of all the happy change has, under God, been due to the singular earnestness, zeal and admirable spirit exhibited by the most prominent members of the Convention.

In 1877 you look in vain for the old party lines of 1868. Alarm, controversy and bitterness are all gone. You find, in many instances, the same members of the clergy and laity, with countenances marked by advancing years and increasing lines of care. One rejoices to meet them, to share in their warm greetings. In many cases the places once filled by eloquent debaters and canonists are occupied by others, wonderfully well fitted to fill them. Still there are differing thoughts. There are those also who will not yield up their own opinions, so far as they range within the circle of the Church's teaching. For this they are to be held in honor. But they are ready now to give credit to others for sincerity truth and loyalty.

Both on the part of the clergy and lay deputies the late session was singularly marked by the ability and oft-times by the eloquence of the speakers. Subjects of the deepest interest connected with the history, doctrines and distinctive position of the Church had evidently been subjected to much thought and study, especially on the part of the lay members of the convention. Had some of

the speakers in the late Church Congress in England been present they might have had their fears allayed at the supposed danger of admitting laymen to legislate on the doctrines of the Church.

Similar assemblies everywhere and especially the Provincial Synod of Canada might learn much from the excellent method of conducting the proceedings in the General Convention. The new President, Dr. Burgess (without any unfavorable comparison with the highly honored deputy who for many years filled the chair), conducted the business with the greatest dignity and decorum. All questions were settled most promptly by the chair with acknowledged wisdom and fairness. The reference of various subjects to standing committees is an admirable system and saves much time and discussion.

With regard to proposed changes in the Book of Common Prayer there was the same feeling as was manifested in the Provincial Synod, and this was so particularly on the part of the laity. It might be interesting to know what opinion many members of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland think of us on this side of the Atlantic.

The feeling referred to (if one might venture to say so) seemed carried somewhat to an extreme in the acknowledged want of shortened services. A commission, however, has been appointed to report on the subject at the next session, and in the meantime the permissive use is granted of the Lectionary of the Church of England.

Looking back now on the close of these proceedings, it is striking to observe how little was accomplished of actual legislation. And is not this so much the better? It is not legislation the Church stands in need of. What, for the most part occupied the Convention had reference to practical church work, and the consideration of details in carrying on that work.

Many subjects of importance were submitted for discussion and wisely laid over for future consideration. Among them were the Provincial System, and a provision for representation more with regard to numbers of the church than dioceses and regulations with regard to Sisterhoods and Deaconesses. A most important canon was passed regarding divorce which may, it is hoped, have a salutary effect in checking, at least, a vast evil and wrong. Due

caution was wisely exercised with reference to new dioceses and missionary jurisdictions, only when there was an acknowledged need and where sufficient provision had been made, as in the case of West Virginia and Illinois, did the Convention assent to an increase of the Episcopate.

But there was one feature in all this practical work which cannot escape notice, and that was the aggressive character of the Church. Her members must never rest satisfied. Too much ignorance and vice and misery exist among the ever increasing masses in the great cities ; want of religious culture for the many ; so many colored freedmen in the South ; so many red men in the West ; so many heathen in all portions of the world living in darkness ! The due sense of all this it is which kills party strife. So it was. The Board of Missions was ready to accept a gladly received proposal from the American Church Missionary Society, for union as an auxiliary. Henceforth the American Church will know of no divided action in her domestic or foreign missions. An important change has also been made in the arrangements for this work. The General Convention, the representative body of the Church, is the real Board of Missions. Every member of the Church is a member of the Missionary Society. A board of management, consisting of all the bishops and of thirty leading members of the Convention, has been appointed to act during the recess for the representative body.

Here is an example worthy of imitation by the Provincial Synod of Canada and by the Church elsewhere. In what way can the representatives of the Church of Christ be better employed than in devising measures for the extension of the means of grace to those in need ?

The Church has, in the legislation and discussion of past years, sufficiently provided for the preservation of the faith and the purity of doctrine. At all events this has become, more and more, the settled conviction of thoughtful minds in the American Church. It is now in a position, more clearly than any other branch of the Church of Christ, to be up and doing what the Divine Head would have her do. Nothing in past history shows more positively how God is pleased to provide means for purposes of good to His creatures. Coming ages will be greatly affected

for good or ill, from the continually increasing numbers, intelligence and energy, which are filling up the vacant places, and crowding the cities on this continent. And what may not this future be, under an influence such as that we have seen is in force by the representative body of the Church, and what might we anticipate of that future without any such influence?

On this organization and development just referred to, it is said in a late article in the *English Church Quarterly*, "the example of the Church in the United States, in this matter, leaves nothing to be desired, and is a most valuable precedent." Something indeed it is that, apart from what God may enable them to do in their own land, the members of the Church in the United States are affording instruction in matters relating to the highest Christian life, alike to the old Mother Church and to her offspring—comprising now no less than sixty-two dioceses in her Colonial Empire! And the feeling in the United States towards that Mother Church is as warm and as affectionate as anywhere under the national rule of Great Britain. Past years of neglect, past national differences are overlooked or forgotten now. The Church literature and theology, never at any time more precious than comes at the present day from the Church in England, is appreciated and made use of nowhere more than in the American Church. It is so ordered that the wisest and the most learned men in the old country have leisure and opportunities by their writings to defend the faith, while active leaders, sons of the sister and daughter churches are engaged in carrying on the practical work of the Church.

Apart from the proceedings of the Convention and the Board of Foreign Missions, no subject came before the Church of greater moment than that taken up by the Free Church Association. This movement is steadily gaining ground. In time the system of free sittings must prevail, because it is right and scriptural. It will prove, especially in the larger cities, an enormous gain. But in connection with this subject is there not one point to which the minds of American Churchmen should be directed with a view to an immediate change? We need not speak of the houses of God solemnly set apart for divine worship only; nor of the awe and reverence due on holy ground, nor of the impropriety of loud talking and hasty movements when there should ever be silence,

save in what relates to divine worship and the teaching of the Word of God. Reverence is not wanting among the members of the American Church. This feeling was always apparent in their stirring service at the opening of the daily sessions, so hearty, so earnest, so generally attended by the deputies and such a bright contrast to similar services in past years. Neither in the House of Deputies nor at the meetings of the Board of Missions was there a want of due decorum, only at times and especially at the adjournments the *place* seemed out of mind. In debate expression of feeling on the part of the audience is suppressed. But is this well? Is it not a want? Is it not often a fitting encouragement with public speakers, and may it not be made the reverse, which is sometimes most desirable? If the present arrangement is only one of convenience or economy let it be decided on as right or wrong or even expedient or inexpedient. What better lesson can American Churchmen teach to those about them than by acting on a determination that henceforth their churches shall be, as well as be called, "Houses of Prayer," and not even for purposes so momentous, so closely connected with heavenly things as was the late session of the Convention ever again be used as *meeting houses*.

But it is now time to bring this paper to a close. While it was being written cheering accounts came, through the English papers, of the doings of the late Church Congress at Croydon. There, too, may be observed some marks of the same Divine Spirit, the fruits of which were so eminently manifest at those late meetings in Boston and Montreal. All discussions were conducted with singular good feeling. There, too, were mutual toleration and courtesy, with expressed difference of opinion on subjects by which many minds are much agitated. There was also an almost unanimous opinion expressed in favor of an efficient representation of the Church, to include co-ordinate representation of the laity.

Let it be that the dear old Mother Church, guided through her peculiar trials, shall gain that which she seems to need—the power to speak and act more fully in a representative character. Let it be that the Church of Ireland shall soon recover from the stunning blows she has received from her own children. Let it be that the

Church in the United States, in Canada and throughout all the Colonial Empire of Great Britain shall be ready to move onward in accordance with every well-grounded hope. Let it be that the Holy Spirit of truth and zeal and love be more fully shed abroad upon the whole Anglican communion, and we may live, or those who follow us will live to see a mighty change all over the earth as great as when it was said of old, "So mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed."

K.

THE OFFICE AND WORK OF A LAYMAN.

It has been very generally taken for granted that the chief *office* of a Layman in the Church was to attend public worship once on Sundays, also on the greater festivals and fasts, and assist in the services; and if elected serve as vestryman; and that his *work* was to pay pew-rent, contribute his quota to missions, etc., and if very zealous aid the rector in the Sunday School, as superintendent or teacher. The writer remembers well when this was looked upon as the *beau ideal* of a good Layman. Of lay-women something more was expected, though it is by no means clear why Christian women, who have their own home work to attend to should be required to do more than Christian men, whose evenings are generally more at their own disposal. We are thankful to say that a change has been gradually taking place in regard to this, and the Church is now impressing upon her laymen the fact that they have imposed upon them office and work in her service just as much, though differing, as have the clergy, work belonging to their office, which they alone can do, and for which they are responsible to the great Head of the Church. The late General Convention had this matter much at heart, and it found expression in the Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops. We cannot open our subject better than by repeating what they say.

Our Church has recognized the value of lay agency; and is rapidly systematizing it. Our pulpit fails to reach a large class of the community, but the gospel can be successfully carried to them, as has been proved by well-tested experience, by lay people, through men's and women's Bible classes, mother's meetings, church guilds, working men's clubs, industrial schools and parish missions. In the full work of such instrumentalities opportunity is offered to all our lay people, both men and women, and all peculiarities of disposition and of taste may find occupation.

In view of this recognized change of opinion in regard to the duties of laymen, and of the above utterance of our Right Reverend Fathers, it will not be deemed amiss that we should endeavor to set forth the "office and work of a *Layman*." We emphasize the

word *Layman*, for we intend to confine what we have to say especially to *men*. A great deal has been written in this country about women's work, sisterhoods, deaconesses, etc., but little or nothing, that we have seen, about men's work.

I. What is the *office* of a layman? From very early times a distinction was made between the clergy and the laity. To the former were assigned certain sacred functions which the latter were forbidden to perform, chiefly touching the administration of the Holy Sacraments. Yet that this distinction was for the sake of order, and did not divide the Church into totally distinct classes, the one of which had entirely different duties from the other, is manifest by many passages of Holy Scripture. When St. Paul came up to Jerusalem to consult about the questions of circumcision, etc. (Acts xv. 22), we read that "the whole church" took part in sending messengers, etc. And the letter they carried to the Gentile Brethren is in the name of "The apostles and elders and brethren." St. Peter and St. John call all Christians "Kings and Priests" (I Pet. i.5, Rev. i.6). Of course this is not to be understood as giving them the same right to officiate in sacred things as have those who are especially called and set apart for that purpose; any more than the fact that God calls all Israel "a Kingdom of Priests" (Ex. xix.6) would have authorized their laity to offer sacrifices. But the term does imply a certain governing and ministerial office inherent in the laity, by virtue of their membership in Christ's Church, which may not be taken from them, and to which those outside of the Church of Christ cannot lay claim. The clergy have their office and duties, the laity have theirs, not antagonistic but to work harmoniously together for the same great end, "the edifying of the body of Christ." All have "gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us," all are bidden "as every man hath received the gift even so minister the same one to another as good stewards of the manifold grace of God" (I Pet. iv.10). Hooker expresses this truth as follows:

There is an error which beguileth many who much entangle both themselves and others by not distinguished Services, Offices and Orders ecclesiastical, the first of which three and in part the second may be executed by the laity, whereas none have or can have the third but the clergy (E. P., V. lxxviii.10).

This is clearly set forth in the Baptismal Service, when the sign

of the Cross is made upon the forehead in token that he "shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified and manfully to fight under His banner against sin, the world and the devil; and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end." Surely this implies something more than inertness, a caring for only one's own salvation and spiritual ease. It means recognized office and organized work.

Let us then consider what belongs to the Layman as partaking of the priestly and kingly character.

1. As priest, the Layman has certain offices to perform in the sanctuary. He is not only to come to the House of the Lord, by his presence show that he worships, and listens respectfully to the word preached, which too many seem to think comprises the whole of their duty, but he has an active part to take, an office to fulfill, a service to perform. This is fully shown in the arrangement of the Church services. These are so ordered that they cannot be rendered by the minister alone. They are *common*—i. e., to be performed in common by clergy and laity; both as priests, the difference being in order and degree. That layman who sits silently in his seat, taking no audible part in the services, ignores and neglects his ministerial office. The Confession, the Lord's Prayer, the Praises, the Creeds, the Litany, lose their value and meaning if performed by the minister alone. If the clergy bless the people, do they not return it? If the one say "the Lord be with you," the others answer "And with thy spirit." If he exhort "Praise ye the Lord," they respond "The Lord's name be praised." And no prayer is complete without the *Amen*, the "so be it," of the laity. It belongs then to the priestly character of the Layman to confess his own sins, to offer his own prayers, to present his own thanksgivings and praise.

And this holds true not only of morning and evening prayer, but also in that which is considered and indeed is in its chief parts the special office of the clergy—the administration of the Sacraments. In Baptism the Layman is to present the child and answer for it as a spiritual parent; he joins audibly in the prayer of thanks, his official position is directly recognized in the last prayer before baptism, where the minister says, "Regard, we beseech thee, the supplications of thy congregation," etc., and the infant brought

by him to the minister to be consecrated to God and made His child, is recommitted to the sponsor as a sacred trust to be brought up as the child of God. Surely all this involves official participation in the baptism, and responsibility because of that official act.

This priestly character of the Layman is even more strikingly manifested in the Eucharistic service. It is his office to bring an offering to the Lord, and some of the number are delegated especially to collect these "Devotions" and "reverently bring them to the priest." The oblations of bread and wine are also to be provided by the laity for the priest to place upon the Holy Table. In ancient times we are told the laity brought material offerings from which the clergy selected what was needed for the Communion. The priest, indeed, presents these "alms and oblations," but it is as representative of "the people." The Layman is to unite in the Confession, in the *Sursum corda* and in the *Trisagion*; and though the priest says alone the Prayer of Humble Access, it is "in the name of all those who shall receive the Communion," so that it is to be regarded as a combined official act of the laity and clergy. The "Consecration" indeed is the special function of the priest as representing Christ, yet the "oblation" and "invocation" and the acts of sacrifice are participated in by the laity, not only by means of the plural form used, "We celebrate and make," etc., but also by the *Amen* with which they make it their own. And though they may not consecrate the elements, yet are they partakers of the altar and their participation thereof is deemed so important that the rubric of the English Church orders "There shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper, except there be a convenient number to communicate with the priest." All this proves that in the services of the Church the function of the Layman is an official one, and to a certain extent partakes of a priestly character.

But if all this be true does it not present the attendance in Church in a different aspect from that with which it is commonly viewed. It is not a volunteer thing; it is not merely for the personal good he may receive by the prayers and sermons that the layman goes; it is with him as much as with the clergyman an official act, which he is bound to perform, and from which nothing but absolute necessity can excuse him. Viewed in this light

how insufficient appear many of the excuses which members of the Church make for absence; excuses they would not dream of offering for neglect of pleasure or of secular official business; excuses they themselves would denounce if presented by their clergyman. And does not this their priestly character teach what should be their behavior during the services? How careful they should be to perform fully and heartily their part. To regard it as a duty as well as a privilege to unite in Confession, Prayer, Praise and Sacrament, and to allow nothing in their own behavior which they would consider irreverent in their clergyman.

This view shows that the bringing a tribute to the Lord in His temple is a sacred duty—not a voluntary thing. It was ordained to Israel of old that none should appear before the Lord empty, but every one was to bring an offering whenever he came to the Temple, according as God had blessed him. The Offertory is a solemn act of worship on the part of laymen, a sacrifice with which “God is well pleased.” And it is to be done as in the sight of God, as to Him and not to man. If this principle were acted on and men gave not by impulse, nor just as feeling might prompt, but regularly and in proportion to their ability, deeming it just as much a duty to do this as to say their prayers, believing it to be a priestly sacrificial act, then there would be no deficiency in the Lord’s treasury. And just as men are sometimes more devout than at others; asking more earnestly for help on special occasions; returning more warmly thanks for personal blessings received; so at such times these special devotions should always be accompanied by special offerings, as “memorials before God.” How significant it is that the Rubric calls these offerings “the *devotions* of the people.”

It follows also that the Layman has his rights in public worship which the clergy are bound to respect. Neither may trespass upon the function of the other. The clergyman may not take from the layman his part any more than the layman may infringe on that of the clergy. The Layman not only may but ought to insist upon it that he shall be allowed full opportunity to exercise his priestly office in the House of God; and it is the duty of the clergy to call

upon him so to do, to remind him of his responsibility, and instruct him how to fulfill it.

2. Again, there are occasions when the services of one in orders cannot be obtained, then the priestly character of the Laymen is more emphatically recognized by a license from the bishop to act as lay-reader. As such he offers the prayers of the people, reads to them the Word of God, and leads in their praises; and the late General Convention is said though we cannot tell exactly how, to have recognized also in them something of the prophetic or exhorting right. Much good has been done in this way by laymen in starting churches and keeping alive old mission stations; and in large cities those who have the faculty for such work may greatly aid the parish clergyman by helping in mission work. We cannot see why those to whom God has given the "gift of tongues" should not exercise it, under proper regulations, for the edifying of His Church.

3. There are special gifts bestowed upon individuals which they are bound to exercise in the House of God, or in the service of the Church. Music has a prominent place in public worship. It is a talent committed to some. In arranging for the Temple service we know that David sought out those whom God had thus gifted and assigned them their lot. So it ought to be with Christian laymen. If God has given them this talent of music and the opportunity of cultivating it, as priests they are bound to use it in sounding His praises, and in leading the thanksgivings of others who have it in a less degree. And so of other gifts. Teaching is another faculty possessed especially by some for which they are responsible before God as his Priests. Certain laymen have this in an eminent degree. They can interest the young, can impart instruction, with greater facility perhaps than can their clergyman. Their position as laymen will often give them an influence beyond his. The very fact that such men think religion a matter of so much importance as to be willing to give up a portion of their day of rest to instruct the ignorant, produces a strong impression of its reality, and draws men to the Church.

4. Not alone to the services of the sanctuary or of the school is the priestly character and work of the Layman confined. Even as the office of the Presbyter is not limited to his ministrations in

the chancel, but is carried with him to the homes of the people, so outside of the Church walls the Layman has religious functions which bring him work and responsibility.

There are sick and infirm and poor around to whom he may more or less minister, not only by giving alms or goods, but by personal visits; the suffering in mind as well as in body to whom he may bring the kindly voice of sympathy, the word of encouragement spoken in season. There are tempted ones whom he may warn, wavering whom he may strengthen, fallen whom he may raise, struggling to whom he may extend the helping hand. It was not to ministers alone but to all that the Lord said "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." How much does the Church lose from a neglect of this priestly work by her laymen! We were once speaking to a man who had been intemperate but was trying—and so far successfully—to reform, and were urging upon him to unite with the Church as a help through the means of grace therein to be found. "Sir," said he, "what would church people do for me? Suppose I was baptized and joined the Church, would one man come forward and welcome me, would they hold out a helping hand, would they watch for me and encourage me? Why, sir, you know that some of them would not let me sit in the same seat with them in Church; and if I fall back none of them would care anything about it. But I have joined the — lodge (a Temperance society), and the moment I was initiated everyone came forward and grasped my hand and welcomed me among them, and expressed joy that I had given up liquor. And they watch me and encourage me, and if I fall they will visit me and bid me try again. They sympathize with my efforts to do right; they feel it will be a disgrace to them all if I fail, and an honor to the lodge if I stand. Will your churchmen do all that for me?" What could be said in answer! Is there not, then, a great work for laymen to do in showing the power of religion? And is it not a neglect by prominent laymen of this their priestly character which hinders the Church from influencing as she ought to do the masses? We believe that many of the social problems which are

the puzzle of the day will find their true solution when our laymen recognize and exercise fully their Priestly character.

5. But especially in his own family is the Layman a Priest, *ex-officio*, we may say. There are certain sacred offices involved in the family relation which no one but its head can perform, with which no one may interfere. To point these out fully and to explain and enforce them would need a volume instead of a page. We speak not now of government but of religious duties. In the oldest times the head of the family was its Priest. The Patriarchs builded altars and offered sacrifices. God recorded it in praise of Abraham, "I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment" (Gen. xviii. 19). And though the right of offering sacrifice with one exception was afterwards confined to the Levitical Order of Priests, the duty here commended of household worship and instruction was continued and enjoined upon every Israelite. The one exception regarding sacrifice bears upon this point. The Passover lamb was to be slain by the head of each family and partaken of by that family. The priestly character of each Israelite was thus far retained. And as regards the duty of instruction in the laws of God, Moses is very explicit.

"Ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." If this were so under the old dispensation wherein the priestly order was so clearly defined and set apart, how much more binding is it under the new. To set up the household altar, to offer the daily sacrifice of prayer and praise, to instruct the family in sacred things and duties, that is the obligation of every Christian layman, that is a responsibility which he can devolve on no one else. The minister, of course, has his duties to perform to each family under his charge, especially to the lambs of the fold, but even he may not assume the place of the father nor can the father throw off upon him his own duties. So sacred do we hold this office that we believe in his family the father is ever superior, and if he ask the visiting minister to officiate in family worship or in blessing the food, it is not as yielding a right, but as an act of courtesy. We are informed

that the late Bishop Onderdonk, of New York, held this opinion so strongly that when visiting he always refused to offer family prayer, or ask the blessing at table, saying that it was the duty of the father to perform this service.

As regards instructing their families in sacred things we fear our laity are more neglectful than they ought to be. They are too apt to throw off this responsibility upon the Rector or the Sunday school. A certain share, indeed, belongs to the former, the latter has its position as a help to the clergyman and parents—exercising delegated powers. The rubric enjoins that the clergyman shall openly instruct in the Catechism the children of his Parish, and that parents shall cause their children to come to church for this purpose. But the doing this does not fulfill all the parental obligation. Such instruction at best must be more or less superficial, it cannot meet individual cases, and it is simply ridiculous to think that the parent or guardian does his whole duty in this respect and need trouble himself no more about the matter if he send his child to Sunday school. We admit fully the importance of a well-ordered and well-taught Sunday school *as an aid to the rector of a parish*; we know that in it many children learn the rudiments of the Christian Faith who otherwise would receive no teaching at all; we believe that it may be made a nursery for the Church. But like everything good it has its abuses, and the chief one is that Christian laymen are too apt to satisfy their consciences when they send their children there, and in consequence neglect almost entirely home religious instruction. And while on this topic we will take the opportunity to say that we fear the old-time home life is passing away. There is a great call now for numerous societies and guilds in connection with the Church not only for work among the poor, etc., but quite as much for amusements. We are taught that the Church must provide for the entertainment as well as worship and instruction of her people. In some parishes on almost every evening in the week there is something going on which draws people, especially the young, from their homes, keeping them out till a late hour, dissipating their minds and exposing them to the meeting of doubtful acquaintances whom their parents would hesitate to admit to their own houses. We cannot think all

this excitement to be healthy. It makes quiet home duties and pleasures distasteful; it is dissipation, all the more dangerous because it seems to have a church sanction and is done more or less under the guise of religion. For the same reasons we doubt if evening services be good for young people. We look back with regret upon the old days when the head of the family assembled around him on Sunday evening the whole household, and talked pleasantly to them of sacred things, and heard them say hymns and texts of Scripture, and closed the day with singing and prayer. The instructions thus given and the impressions thus made by loving parental words are not soon nor easily effaced. This part of the priestly office of each layman who is the head of a family cannot be better set forth than in the exhortation the Church addresses to sponsors.

Chiefly ye shall provide that they may learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health, and that (*these persons*) may be virtuously brought up to lead a Godly and a Christian life.

We feel deeply on the subject of home influence. We know the good which rightly exerted it may accomplish. We know also the evils which result either from overstrictness in making home gloomy and distasteful to the young, or from neglect in leaving them too much to themselves. Both these may result from false notions of religious duty. On the one side when the parent forbids all amusements as sinful and drives children away from home to seek relaxation; on the other when he deems it his duty to leave the family circle to itself while he indulges in what may be called religious dissipation. This last is now the more common evil. Some may think it strange that we should ever call church-going wrong; but church services are means to an end, whether it be to serve God or benefit ourselves, and if attendance on them be made an end and allowed to interfere with higher duties, then it ceases to be good.

We were once visiting a sick man. He confessed that he had gone very wrong, but, said he, "I attribute my wickedness to my parents' having got religion." Seeing a surprised look, he explained: "Yes, there was a large family of us, and all were con-

tented to spend our evenings at home, for we had games and music and good fun. But there was a revival in the neighborhood and our parents took to going to meeting every night and stayed out till ten or eleven o'clock, and it got to be dull at home, so as soon as they were gone out, I used to slip away to the engine house near by and got into bad company, and so went on to worse and worse till I learned to swear and drink and went altogether to the bad." If the religion of these parents had been of the right kind it would have taught them that their first duty was to their own family.

This responsibility is not confined to our own children. It extends, so far as it can be exercised, to all in the family. The Church recognizes this duty of teaching as being not only for their own children but for "servants and apprentices." May not much of the insubordination and trouble among these, of which we hear so much complaint, arise from a neglect of this duty? Would not a realization and a sincere practice of the family priesthood have a tendency to bring about a better understanding between different classes of society? We hear much of the need of taking the Church to what is called "the masses," we have had wise talking of the necessity of instructing them in their duties toward their employers. It is more than probable that if the latter would always do their duty towards those who are subordinate to them the necessity spoken of and dangers feared might not have existed. We think it full time that something should be said of the responsibilities of masters, and especially of those who have young people under them.

We have so far confined what we have said of the priestly character of the Layman to the Church and family, but we think we may go further and apply it to his connection with the State and the world. Though not perhaps so clearly marked, yet we believe it imposes responsibility upon him here also. Indeed it may be said that his priesthood may in some respects be made in these more useful than that of the minister, because considered less professional. Conspicuous upon the front of the mitre of the Jewish High Priest was a plate of pure gold, with these words engraved upon it: "Holiness to the Lord." And this is what the

life of every layman should show forth to the world. His sacred character is not to be left at the church door, or at home, but carried with him to the forum, the senate, the market, everywhere, to guide and restrain his actions. If the unhappy men, members of the church, whose defalcations and dishonesty have lately been detected and proclaimed to the world had been mindful of their priestly character, surely it would have been to them a safeguard. If those who rule and legislate do it as servants of the Lord, not for self, in the spirit of fear and holiness, we should not have political rings and embezzlements of public monies. Honesty and probity would characterize our merchants and the officers of trust companies. The world would come to look upon religion as a reality, not a mere profession. Would that Christian laymen might realize their high office, and offer to God the sacrifice of a Holy Life.

II. We are next to set forth the kingly character of the Layman, i. e., his rights and duties in the government of the Church. These are partly provided for by canons, partly inherent.

1. The Church recognizes in the laity, and regulates by canon, a certain share in her government. This indeed is not yet, as one would naturally think it ought to be, entirely confined to those who are communicants; but the right feeling is gradually growing to make it so. The laws regarding the qualifications required in laymen for church offices vary in different dioceses. But in all, we believe, those recognized as such elect the Wardens and Vestrymen. Here, then, is the first right of the Layman—that of voting at the annual election; and like all rights this also brings responsibility. The Layman ought to attend the Easter meeting, and use his influence and his vote to see that proper persons are chosen on the vestry. These elections too often are allowed to go by default; the voters being satisfied with the existing vestry, do not think it worth while to attend and vote. This is wrong. As members of the congregation they ought to feel an interest in its affairs and show it by coming out in goodly numbers, not only to vote but to hear the treasurer's report and that of the Rector on the state of the parish, which ought always to be read at such meetings. It is too much an American custom to throw off

responsibility on others and take it for granted that they are doing right. We see this largely manifested by bank directors and other trustees, as well as in political matters. There is too much of it in the Church. If there be trouble, dissension with the minister, or between parties, then there is sure to be a full meeting and great interest manifested; but if all be peaceful only a faithful few will go. This is not as it ought to be. If men will attend because there is strife, surely much more ought they to do so when there is harmony. Let the Layman exercise as a duty his right of attendance and voting at the meeting of the congregation; it shows an interest in the church and encourages the Rector and the vestrymen in carrying on their work. Indifference may be better than contest, but it is very trying to the soul of the Rector.

The right of voting carries with it in Church as well as in State the obligation to sustain the government thus elected, especially by paying taxes. The Church indeed has no power to assess and collect these, but the duty of contributing is none the less incumbent on every voter. It is recognized by canon, it is declared in Scripture. We have already spoken of this as one of the priestly offices of the Layman, it belongs also to his governing character. It thus is shown to be of two-fold obligation.

2. The Layman if chosen thereto by the congregation may hold the office of Warden and Vestryman.¹ As the duties belonging to these offices are not generally understood we propose to discuss them at some length.

In 1804 Dr. Croes, afterwards Bishop of the Diocese, made a minute report to the Convention of New Jersey upon the duties of wardens and vestrymen, which Mr. Murray Hoffman quotes with approval in his Treatise on Church Law. We give it here in full.

The duties of CHURCH-WARDENS are :

1. To provide for the churches of which they have the care, a Prayer Book and Bible of suitable size at the expense of the parish.

¹ This latter is peculiar to our own Church. In England, with a few exceptions, there are wardens but no vestrymen. A vestry there is a meeting of all the parishioners to vote a church-rate or for other parish purposes. With us the Rector, Wardens and Vestrymen constitute the Vestry.

2. To make the collections which are usual in the parishes.

3. To provide, at the expense of the congregation, a sufficient quantity of fine white bread, and good, wholesome wine, for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

4. To provide a proper book at the charge of the parish, in which shall be written by the rector, or in case of vacancy by one of the wardens, the name of every person baptized, married and buried in the church, and the time when such baptism, marriage and burial took place.

5. To present to the Bishop of the diocese, or if there is no Bishop, to the chairman of the Standing Committee of the Church in the State, every priest and deacon residing in the parish to which they belong, who has voluntarily relinquished his sacerdotal office, and uses such employments as belong to laymen.

6. To take care that the church of which they have the charge be kept in good repair, well glazed and free from dirt and dust, as becomes the house of God; that the church-yard be decently fenced, and to cause that order be preserved during divine service.

7. To diligently see that the parishioners resort to church on Sundays, and there continue the whole time of divine service; and to gently admonish them when they are negligent.

8. To prevent any idle persons continuing in the church-yard or porch during divine service, by causing them either to enter the church or depart—and to prohibit the sale of anything in the yard.

9. To give an account to the corporation of the church, if it has no treasurer, at the expiration of each year, of the money they have received, and what they have expended in repairs, etc.; and when they go out of office to give a fair account of all their money transactions relative to the church, and deliver up to their successors the church property in their possession.

The duties of VESTRYMEN are:

To transact all the temporal business of their respective churches, to collect the monies stipulated to be paid to the minister; and, at the expiration of any year, if there be a deficiency of the sum requisite, to give information thereof to the congregation, convened for that purpose; and, if necessary, to enforce the payment of the sum deficient; also, in the absence of the wardens, to do the several duties which are more particularly assigned to them.

There are other duties prescribed by canon to wardens or vestrymen, not mentioned in the above, also deserving notice.

(a.) When there is no rector they are to see that none but one "duly licensed or ordained to minister in this Church" shall officiate in the congregation (Digest I. 13). Also in a vacancy they are to give permission to a minister to officiate, which he may not do without their consent. (I. 14. §VI. 1.) This provision needs no explanation.

(b.) In some dioceses on the occurrence of a vacancy in the

rectorship, they are to give immediate notice of the same to the Bishop. This is a matter both of right and courtesy. It ought always to be done even if the Diocesan Canon may not require it. It is a duty too much neglected, to the injury of the Church. We have heard wardens complaining of the great care and responsibility laid upon them in supplying the vacant pulpit. Obedience to this would relieve them; and give the Bishop that which he ought to have, some influence in the selection of his presbyters.

(c.) The most important and responsible of their duties is the selection and calling of a rector. Everyone knows how entirely the success of the parish depends upon the character of the minister. The Vestry cannot be too careful in making their choice. They are not to be guided by individual preferences, or the wishes of friends, nor to be influenced by popular clamor or party views. They ought to consider carefully, the needs of the parish; every man will not suit every place. A minister who will almost entirely fail in one position, placed in another will prove very successful. Vestries are too apt to be influenced by the desire to obtain one who is a talented preacher, without considering how many other qualifications equally important may be needed. We have known men called because of a single sermon which happened to take the fancy of the congregation and prove entirely unfitted for that particular parish. In some churches preaching is comparatively of minor importance; a minister is needed who is strong in organizing work; or excellent as a pastor in visiting among the poor and sick. In another place a sound, eloquent preacher is almost essential. On one congregation deep learning would be thrown away, but highly appreciated and very useful in another. We once knew a vestry who felt this so deeply that it informed the rector he owed it to himself to seek a field where his learned sermons would be better understood, that for themselves they confessed these were beyond them, they were unworthy of such a waste of talent. The hint was taken and the wise man found a more educated audience whom he suited and where he was more useful. But it would have been much better if the vestry had thought of this before making their selection of a rector. In short, vestries ought to study the idiosyncracies of their con-

gregations and fit the rector to them. If this were more carefully done there would be fewer clerical changes. And it is to be done not by appointing a committee to go and hear the man preach, still less by having him come on trial—an abomination as ridiculous as buying a house by the specimen brick—but by a careful inquiry into the man's character, temper, disposition and past history. Congregations are apt to blame the minister if he does not suit, when the blame should really fall upon the vestry for want of care in making a choice.

(d.) After an election the Wardens are to send notice thereof to the Bishop (I. 14.I).

(e.) It is the duty "of the Church-wardens or Vestry to give information to the Bishop of the state of the Congregation, under such heads as shall have been committed to them in the notice given as aforesaid," i. e., of the Episcopal Visitation (I.14. §IV.2).

It must be observed that this is altogether different from the report required to be made by the Rector to the Annual Diocesan Convention. Of course if the Bishop in his notice does not ask for any information they are not bound to give it. And we believe that Bishops seldom if ever do thus officially ask it. But there it stands, as quoted in the Canon, a testimony that the Church recognizes the right of the Bishops to demand full information of the condition of the Parishes. We have already spoken of this in a former article on the Rights of Bishops. Here we shall only say that the exercise of this prerogative makes just the difference between a visit of the Bishop and an *Episcopal Visitation*. This last even Webster defines to be :

The act of a superior or superintending officer who visits a corporation, college, church or other house, to examine into the manner in which it is conducted, and see that its laws and regulations are duly observed and executed.

It is evident the canons contemplate such a visitation; our clergy are as yet too congregational in feeling to submit to it, but such is Church law, and we may add such in old times was Church usage.

(f.) In case of neglect on the part of the Minister to perform the regular services or refusal to allow others to officiate for him, the Vestry have power, "with the written consent" of the pre-

scribed authorities, "to open the doors of their church," etc. (I.14. §VI.3.) We mention this because it is in the Canon. We trust that rarely if ever has there been occasion to perform this duty.

(g.) In case of controversy with the Minister, the Vestry may apply to the Bishop for a Board of Reference. (II.4. §I.)

(h.) Those desiring to become candidates for Holy Orders and those who, having passed through the candidateship apply for Ordination, are required to present to the Standing Committee of the Diocese testimonials as to character and qualification, signed by the Rector and Vestry of the Parish to which they belong, or by a specified number of communicants of the Church. (I.2 §III and §I.6.IV.)

This is a very important duty. These testimonials "testify from personal knowledge and belief," not only that the candidate is pious, sober and honest, etc., but also that the signers believe him to "possess such qualifications as fit him" for the ministry.

Complaints are often made that improper or unqualified persons obtain admission into the ministry. May not one cause be the carelessness of Vestries in signing such papers? The Standing Committees must be guided very much by these testimonials, they seldom can have personal knowledge of the applicant. We wish laymen could be made to understand that to sign such papers without due consideration is a breach of trust. They are not to be signed as a matter of course. No one ought to put his name to such a document unless he really means what it says. This is one of the safeguards the Church has placed at the door of entrance to the Sacred Ministry, let the laity see to it that it be carefully watched.

3. An official position in which the Layman may be placed is that of "Deputy" to the Diocesan or General Convention. This position involves serious duties. As such he is called upon to legislate for the church. He responsible to a certain extent for the maintenance of her doctrine, worship and discipline. Of her doctrine and worship, for the General Convention has power to alter the Prayer Book; of her discipline, for conventions make her laws. In no Church in Christendom is a greater responsibility thrown

upon the laity than in ours. And they have heretofore shown themselves worthy of the trust. A large majority has always been found on the side of law and order, of keeping to the old standards. Indeed complaint has been made that if anything the laity are too conservative. As a rule those chosen have been men of wide experience and mature wisdom, not easily led astray by popular whims. They love the church as it is, and while willing to do all that may be necessary to enlarge its usefulness, fear innovations and resist experimental changes.

The great body of our laity are loyal to the Church, and it is well that we have in them a protection against the enthusiasm of some of the younger clergy, who, with a zeal that is not always according to knowledge, would do away with the safe-guards that protect us on the one side from mediæval innovations, and on the other from Protestant errors. The duty of the Layman in this position of trust is clear. He is to be conservative in keeping up the old ways, yet not so conservative as to put obstructions in those ways. Therefore the Layman, in order that he may act intelligently and judiciously, is bound to study the Church, her history, customs and laws. Thus only can he duly exercise his office as legislator. This indeed is incumbent on all her members.

4. The Layman may also be one of the Standing Committee of the Diocese. It would take too long to enumerate the duties which as such may devolve upon him. They are specified in the canons, which those chosen for this office should study.

5. On removing from one Parish to another the Layman is bound to obtain from the Rector a "certificate stating that he is a communicant in good standing." (II, 12, § I.) The neglect of this causes confusion, and makes the Parish lists inaccurate.

Such are the principal offices in the Church assigned to the Layman as a governor. We wish they were regarded more as sacred trusts involving religious duties. There are two mentioned by Bishop Croes in the Report printed above to which we call special attention. These are the obligations of keeping the church building in due repair, etc., which is the special duty of Wardens, the other that of "collecting the monies stipulated to be paid to the minister," and if there be a deficiency calling upon the congregation

to pay it, which belongs to the whole body of the Vestry. Generally it is left to one or two persons to attend to this, and people shrink from their obligations, to the great injury of the church and the serious loss of the minister.

We shall say little or nothing of the Layman as King or ruler in his own family. We have already said a great deal on this under the head of his Priesthood. We can here only say that the Christian Layman is bound to exercise a sufficient though kind control over his household. As bishop or superintendent of his flock we may address to him the exhortation of the Ordinal: "Be so merciful, that you be not too remiss; so minister discipline, that you forget not mercy."

Another division of our subject was the *Work* of the Layman in the Church. Something has been already said on this subject by inference; for Office implies work. There is, however, a wide field for discussion opened to us regarding work that may be considered the special duty of the laity aside from any official position they may hold in the Church. Work belonging to every layman, but differing for each according to differing gifts and position; as visitors, as nurses, as collectors for charitable purposes, as aids in various ways to the Rector in Parish work. In large cities especially every one may find opportunity to do good service. All have talents committed to their care for the use of which, *for the Master*, they are responsible. All are stewards and will have the demand made; "give an account of thy stewardship."

But the full setting forth of this branch of our subject requires a separate treatise, and this article has already reached its limits. If we can induce any layman to think more seriously of his responsibilities with the wish in future to accomplish them better, we shall be thankful.

EDWARD B. BOGGS.

LEGISLATION ON MISSIONS.

The recent legislation on missions, in the Board of Missions and in the General Convention, was of more than ordinary importance.

In the Board of Missions a unanimous resolution was adopted, approving of the preposition of the Church Missionary Society to make their work hereafter auxiliary to the regular work of the Board. Since the adjournment of the Board, this has been consummated; and on Sunday, the fourth of November, a grand thanksgiving missionary meeting was held in the Church of the Holy Trinity, New York; on which occasion addresses were made by the Rector the Rev. Stephen H. Tyng, Jr., D.D., Bishop Bedell and the Rev. Chas. Hall, D.D., expressive of the joyful feelings of the whole church at the glorious consummation.

The terms of the union are:

First. The American Church Missionary Society is to retain its charter, its organization and administration, and the appropriation of its funds.

Second. The American Church Missionary Society is to become a recognized auxiliary of the Board of Missions.

Third. The American Church Missionary Society shall consult with the Domestic and Foreign Committees of the Board and occupy such fields or stations, or do such work at home or abroad, as may be arranged in mutual consultation.

Fourth. The American Church Missionary Society shall make annual reports to the Board of Missions.

Nothing of greater importance than this to the cause of missions has been accomplished for years. The discussions about High and Low Church in the conduct of the mission work will now

cease; a spirit of toleration will henceforth prevail, and men of all schools of thought will work together, and all will gain from being thus brought into contact with those who differ from them.

Another change of vital importance was made. For a long time the conviction has been growing that the work of missions might be carried on more effectively by being brought under the immediate oversight of those, who are the direct representatives of the whole church. By a very large majority of both houses of the General Convention, the Board of Missions, which for fifty years has had the direction of the missionary work was abolished, and the General Convention given the sole control of all the missions of the Church. Whenever the Convention is in session, a part of its time is to be devoted exclusively to the consideration of missions. And thirty men—fifteen clergymen and fifteen laymen—were appointed to have the entire control of the work in the interval between the meetings of the convention. These men are divided into two committees, the one Domestic and the other Foreign. In the Domestic Department there are two sub-committees, to whom are respectively assigned the special interests of the Freedmen, and the Indians, the Church Missionary Society working as an auxiliary association under the direction of the Board of Managers.

Many of the best friends of missions are very anxious about the results of this radical change; and general regret is felt that so many life-long workers, in the great cause must necessarily be cut off from all legislation in its behalf. But if the sanguine anticipations of those who have made the change shall be realized, every true friend of missions must rejoice.

The work that is assigned the committee of fifteen in charge of Domestic missions, is probably the most important in charge of any one committee in existence. In it is comprised the missionary work of our immense territory, including the Indian tribes, and four millions of emancipated slaves, a large proportion of whom have within the last few years fearfully degenerated, and must now become complete heathen, unless more active measures be speedily taken by the different Christian denominations. These people are our fellow-citizens; they have all the privileges in the government that the whites have; and unless they are elevated

intellectually and morally, must continue to be the tools of designing politicians, and a constant cause of disturbance in the body politic. The troubles of the past year clearly show what we have to fear in that direction.

The Church can give these people the teachings they especially need; and the extraordinary success that has attended the small efforts she has made in their behalf clearly shows that she has no more interesting field in which to labor.

But what she has done is almost nothing in comparison with what remains to be done. This church has for twelve years raised probably only one fourth as much for Freedmen as she has raised for work among the Indians, numbering probably less than one fifteenth the number of the colored people.

Why is there so much less interest in one than in the other? Certainly it cannot be because it is less important, or less encouraging, for there is no mission on the continent of more importance than the mission to the Freedmen and the decided success that has attended the small efforts that have been made in their behalf, has certainly been encouraging.

The only explanation of the matter is that the one has been fully and constantly brought before the people by the press and living earnest agents, the other only through the reports and appeals in the *Spirit of Missions* and by means of circulars to the clergy. When the committee in charge of this great and pressing work shall make the whole church acquainted with the startling facts in connection with the moral condition of this unhappy people, there will be no difficulty in getting funds to carry on the work. But these facts will never be learned from circulars to the clergy, and reports in the *Spirit of Missions*.

While we are doing so little, the Church of Rome is making rapid headway among them; and has strong hopes of holding the balance of political power in the country through this agency. But the great majority of these people are in danger of adopting a system of worship as largely made up of Fetichism as of Christianity. We can give them, better than any other body of Christians, the teaching they need; and if we do the work faithfully, we can

speedily raise up a body of most efficient missionaries to extend the blessings of the gospel in that mysterious land from which their ancestors were brought to our shores.

H. R. S.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS OF 1877.

We do not propose now to give any extended notice of the papers and speeches of this Congress, that can be better done when we have before us the printed volume of the proceedings. But we give instead as useful for future reference, a list of the subjects which have been discussed at previous Church Congresses, with the time and place of meetings :

FIRST CHURCH CONGRESS, New York, Oct. 6, 1874.

1. Limits of Legislation as to Doctrine and Ritual.
2. Clerical Education.
3. The mutual obligations of Capital and Labor.
4. Relation of the Episcopal Church to other Christian Bodies.

SECOND CHURCH CONGRESS, Philadelphia, Nov. 9, 1875.

1. Ultramontanism and Civil Authority.
2. Ministrations of the Church to the Working Classes.
3. The best mode of procuring and preparing Candidates for the Ministry.
4. Church Music.
5. Nature and Extent of Episcopal Authority.
6. The Parochial System and Free Preaching.
7. Bible Revision.
8. Mutual Limitations of Religious and Scientific Inquiry.
9. Best methods of promoting Spiritual Life.

THIRD CHURCH CONGRESS, Boston, Nov. 14, 1876.

1. The True Place of Art in Christianity.
2. Foreign Missions.
3. Relation of the Protestant Episcopal Church to Freedom of Religious Thought.
4. The Relation of Secular and Religious Education.
5. The Morals of Politics.

6. The Just Liberty in the Adaptation of the Services to the varied Wants of the People.
7. The Prevention and Cure of Drunkenness.
8. Revivals and Christian Nurture.

FOURTH CHURCH CONGRESS, New York, Oct. 30, 1877.

1. The Church Architecture we need.
2. Relation of Christianity to Social and National Life in America.
3. Spiritual Forces in Civilization.
4. Relation of the Popular Press to Christianity in America.
5. Influence of the Pulpit on Modern Thought and Life.
6. Relation of Christianity to Popular Amusements.
7. Organization and Administration of Charities.
8. The True Policy towards the Indian Tribes.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE PRAYER BOOK. *Its History, Language and Contents.* By Evan Daniel, M. A., Principal of St. John's College, Battersea. LONDON: WILLIAM WELLS GARDNER. NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG AND CO. pp. 456.

In the preface the author says that this "will be found to differ from most other works on the same subject, in the prominence which it assigns to the explanation of the text and the method of the Prayer Book." It is therefore specially adapted for the use of "young church folk," though he "is not without hope that his book may be of service to the laity generally."

The writer expresses too modest an estimate of the worth of his book. It is exceedingly valuable to both clergy and laity. Indeed we know of no treatise on the Prayer Book in which so much useful information can be found, so clearly expressed and in a manner so easily available for reference. The whole book (the English of course) is gone through verbatim, and an explanation given of all the obsolete words. There is a very comprehensive yet sufficiently minute introductory history of the formation of the Prayer Book. The sources of the various parts are stated, as of the Collects and other prayers, together with the changes which have been

made from time to time. A Chronological Table of events, a set of Examination Papers, and an Index, complete the volume. We wish the laity would procure and study it. Its teachings are sound yet not extreme. It contains an immense mass of information not easily accessible. The clergy will find it very useful for reference, and as a help in lecturing on the Prayer Book. We recommend it as of special value to the theological student.

A HANDBOOK OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH. *Giving its History and Constitution, 1785-1877.* By William Stevens Perry, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of Iowa, NEW YORK: THOMAS WHITTAKER. 1877. pp. 314.

Churchmen will find this a very useful book of reference. It gives first, a brief history of the organization of the Church in the United States, including an account of the manner in which the Episcopal Succession was obtained from the Church of England. Then there is a brief sketch of the proceedings of each General Convention from 1785 down to 1874. A very valuable part is the "Appendix," giving a summary of statistics showing our progress for nearly half a century—1829-1874. A study of this book will enable those interested in the Church to obtain a very good idea of its work and growth.

AT EVENTIDE. *Discourses by Nehemiah Adams, D. D., Senior Pastor of Union Church, Boston.* BOSTON: D. LOTHROP & Co. pp. 278. \$1.25.

These sermons preached in Charleston, S. C., by a Boston pastor, are printed at the request of a number of Evangelical pastors of the former city. They are above the average of such discourses; indeed some of them are very striking, such as those on "The Jew and the Roman watching the Sepulchre," and "The man at the Wheel." There appears to be nothing that can be called denominational about them.

VOYAGE OF THE "STEADFAST." By Wm. H. G. Kingston. BOSTON: D. LOTHROP AND COMPANY. 1877. \$1.00.

Mr. Kingston's stories have in them adventures enough to satisfy any boy, while the moral is always good. As boys crave such books and if they cannot get good will read bad ones, parents will do well to provide for them those which are safe, as this is.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY. *With a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ.* By George P. Fisher, D. D., Professor in Yale College. NEW YORK: SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & Co., 1877. pp. 591. \$3.00.

We cannot give a better synopsis of this book than by quoting from the preface.

I have undertaken, first, to describe the ancient Roman World, including both Heathen and Jewish Society, into which Christianity entered, and in which it first established itself; secondly, to examine the New Testament documents from which our knowledge of the beginnings of the Christian religion must be derived; and thirdly, to discuss some of the most important topics connected with the Life of Jesus and the Apostolic Age.

If to this we add a chapter on "Christianity in the First Century," a very good idea may be formed of the contents of the volume.

We think Professor Fisher has performed very well the work he has undertaken. He writes in a clear, flowing style, so that unlike many such books, this affords very pleasant reading. His account of the ancient religions and laws, is full and accurate, and that of their customs and morals is especially interesting, showing plainly the need that existed for the Christian Religion. In the second part we have an account of the establishment of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures, particularly of the Gospels. The general reader will find much information in these chapters about modern criticism, and its results. If his faith in the authenticity of the Gospel narratives has been shaken, he may here find an answer to his doubts. The part of the book we differ from is where he describes the government of the Church in the first century. Yet even here we think Professor Fisher really gives up the question of Episcopal Government, for he says [p. 553.];

It is not improbable that before the death of the Apostle John, it (the Episcopate) was established in the Asian Churches, which were within the circle of his special influence, and where the traces of an Episcopal constitution first appeared.

If he grant this, and believe the Apostle John to have been inspired, we do not see how he can deny the Apostolic origin and authority of Bishops. It seems strange that men can believe that in this short period so radical a change in church government as from parity to Episcopacy could have taken place, and no trace of it be found in a single early writer. Thus in a previous chapter [page 378], he concedes the same thing, yet afterward maintains, that "the identity of bishops and presbyters is recognized throughout the New Testament writings," and cites as instances, the address of St. Paul to the Elders of Ephesus; and his

instructions to Timothy and Titus about ordaining Elders, whom he rightly enough claims to be here identical with bishops. But he fails to see that in the first cases Paul himself is acting as what we now call bishop; and in the second instance he is placing Timothy and Titus in the same position as Bishops in Ephesus and Crete, to *ordain elders and set in order the things that are wanting*. If elders could ordain, why must these two be expressly put there to ordain? And it is undoubtedly to such action of the apostles that Clement of Rome alludes in the often quoted passage to which he refers Clem. Rom. XLIV (*not XLV.*) We think almost any candid reader must feel that in asserting such a change in church government our author is influenced more by prejudice than by regard to facts. He acknowledges that all the early writers speak of Episcopacy as having always existed. He acknowledges that it was so in the days of the Apostle John, he can scarcely expect us to believe, without proof, that it sprang up in a space of thirty years, "by a gradual growth."

With this exception, which, as we have said, is so mildly put that it defeats itself, we heartily commend this interesting and instructive volume, and suggest it would make an appropriate Christmas gift.

THE FINAL PHILOSOPHY, or *System of Perfectable Knowledge issuing from the Harmony of Science and Religion*. By Charles Woodruff Shields, D. D., Professor in Princeton College. NEW YORK. SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & Co., 1877. pp. 609. \$3.00.

It is a good thing that our teachers of theology, instead of shutting their ears to the assertions of an antagonism between science and religion, or contenting themselves with sneering at the attacks which in the name of science are made upon the supernatural, are now studying the questions at issue in a candid spirit. A chair of instruction on the harmony between science and religion has been "secured in the College of New Jersey," worthily filled by Professor Shields, and this large volume is the first fruits of his labors.

The book contains two parts: I.—"The Philosophical Parties as to the Relations between Science and Religion." II.—"The Philosophical Theory of the Harmony of Science and Religion." The first giving the history and facts, and the second the different theories based upon those facts, ending with the author's own theory as to the *Philosophia Ultima*, or "Project of the Perfected Sciences and Art."

The first part contains a great deal of useful information, being a summary of the attitudes of Religion and the various Sciences towards each other in different ages and aspects; those of modern times being presented at some length. Thus we have—1. The *antagonism* between Religion and Science, in Astronomy, Geology, Anthropology, Psychology, Sociology, Theology and Philosophy, with the results. 2. The *Indifferentism* between them leading to a schism, stated under the same heads. 3. The Modern Eclecticism, with a special chapter on "Modern Scepticism."

The second part reverses, as it were, the picture, and sets forth the true harmony which must exist between the Word and Works of the Great Creator. In this after preliminary remarks on "unsolved problems," he considers the "Positive Philosophy," "The Absolute Philosophy," "The Final Philosophy," and "The *Philosophia Ultima*," giving his own views in this last.

From this *resumé* our readers can obtain a fair general idea of the contents of the book. They will see that it covers a great deal of ground and presents subjects of deep interest. The historical part is very well done; those familiar with the philosophy of the sciences, will find it convenient to refresh their memories; and those who have not read much on these subjects, and have not time to read the originals, will be saved a great deal of labor, and yet obtain a very fair idea of what has been written about them. The author writes clearly and forcibly. We consider this book a valuable addition to the literature of Religion and Science.

WILL DENBIGH. *Nobleman*. BOSTON; ROBERTS BROTHERS. 1877. pp. 329. \$1.00.

Another of the *No Name Series*. A simple story, based on the old theme, how a young girl fancies she loves a youth whom she views not as he is, but as she imagines him to be; how her idol is dethroned, and how she comes at last to love and marry one much older than herself, whom at first she thought she could never so love. But though the theme may be old, the story is fresh and the characters well drawn. We are specially pleased with that of Tom Flemyng. A good insight is given us into Devonshire life and scenery. It is a book we can commend to those who wish for something amusing yet healthy in tone.

MEDIEVAL PAPAL AND RITUAL PRINCIPLES. *Stated and Contrasted*, by J. H. Hobart, D. D., NEW YORK. T. WHITTAKER, BIBLE HOUSE. pp. 162. 75c.

The principle part of this treatise first appeared in one of the Church Periodicals. It is well worth collecting, enlarging and publishing in this more permanent form. The value of a work is by no means in proportion to its size; and those who will be at the pains to read carefully this little book will find a great deal of good thought compressed into a little space. Very important distinctions are drawn in section xi between *Ritualism*, *Mediævalism* and *Popery*, which the careless speakers and writers of the day would do well to consider.

The main constituent principles of MEDIEVALISM are considered to be what is commonly called *Eucharistic Adoration* and *Spiritual Direction*, and he argues at some length against both. The argument against the former is, we think, not quite as strong as it might be made, being principally based on the fact that no such worship is anywhere commanded, and that it formed no part of the object for which that Holy Sacrament was instituted. It by no means follows that a thing is not allowed because no where expressly commanded. He says :

What the Sacramental certainty is we know, first to show forth the Lord's Sacrifice; second to be our heavenly meat and drink. What the Sacramental possibilities are is *terra incognita*, where each step is taken at our peril p. 13.

The argument is, however, strengthened in section v by an appeal to the Primitive Liturgies, showing that there is no warrant in any of them for such a practice. We are surprised that the author does not also point out, what seems to have escaped the notice of many, that our own Liturgy has no trace of any such custom. Neither in the English nor in the American service (which latter is much fuller) is there a single prayer or act of adoration addressed directly to Christ, unless indeed a part of the *Gloria in Excelsis* be an exception, and this comes in the *Post Communion*. But it is worthy of special notice how carefully all the prayers are addressed to the FATHER. To Him confession is made, in His name absolution declared, to Him (Holy Father) thanks are given, to Him the hearts are lifted up, to Him the prayer of humble access is offered; it is "according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son" that "we celebrate and make the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make," and so through the whole *Oblation* and *Invocation* it is the FATHER who is addressed, and after the reception, it is God the Father who is thanked "for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed—with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ." Suffici-

ent attention has not been called in the arguments on this subject to this feature of our Eucharistic service. Dr. Hobart could show that in this it closely follows the Primitive Liturgies; and that in its teachings on this subject mediævalism is a departure from the primitive idea of worship. Indeed neither in Scripture nor in our church formularies is their warrant for Eucharistic Adoration.

What is said of the other principle of mediævalism, *Spiritual Direction* is of equal, if not of greater, importance, in view of recent developments.

This is defined to be :

Habitual recourse to and reliance upon priestly counsels in connection with Confession and Absolution, rather than dependence upon one's own convictions of right and duty. p. 14.

The evil of habitual confession, etc., is thus stated :

The sense of personal responsibility to God is blunted. The intermediate agency of the confessor takes the place of the direct relation of the penitent to God. p. 34.

In all that is said on these subjects careful distinctions are drawn as between the true and false doctrines of the *Real Presence*; and between the useful occasional seeking of pastoral advice and the regular confessional. So also in what is said on Ritual, care is taken to show that there is a wise and proper attention to Ritual and an excessive.

Excessive Ritualism proceeds from one of two causes, a desire to promote mediæval ideas of religion, or a mere æsthetic pleasure in Ritual performances.

What is said on this point is carefully discriminative. Dr. Hobart does not run a tilt against all ritualism; but points out on the whole very fairly its uses and its abuses. We bespeak for this little book a wide circulation. We are certain that it is calculated to do good, and that it will aid a perplexed mind in arriving at sound conclusions on these vexed questions.

HERMENEUTICS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, by Dr A. Immer, Professor of Theology in the University of Berne. Translated from the German by Albert H. Newman. ANDOVER: WARREN F. DRAPER. 1877. pp. 395. \$2.25.

The translator has expressed the character of this work very well in his preface as "not in all respects an authoritative guide in the interpretation of the New Testament, but rather as an exposition of the principles that have guided the German exegetists of the present generation, and that have done so much for the ascertaining of the exact historical sense of the sacred writings."

There are two elements in it which need to be very carefully discriminated : the one his principles of exegetical study, comprising its modes, its aims and its means ; and the other his views as to the material on which this study is to be employed.

These lead him to introduce discussions involving the character of the writings as Revelation, and the extent to which their writers were controlled by Inspiration.

In reference to these questions we do not think his opinion tenable, on any theory which can accept the writers of the Bible a *ὑπο πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι* (2, Pet. i, 21), or can receive the books thereof as *authoritative* teachings of the *revealed* truth of God. Nor is there any necessity, upon the very principles of interpretation which he maintains as fundamental, that they should be brought into discussion.

The one sole object of interpretation, as a separate study, he lays down to be (p. 100), "that the reader may be put in a position to think what the author thought and as he thought it," and "to remove the differences between ourselves and the author." That as exegetists we have no concern with any question but, What is the true sense of the words as they stand there before us? For this purpose we should use all the appliances of grammar, linguistic usage, and the connection, with all the outside help from history, knowledge of customs, and modes of thought that we can gain ; the fair, unbiased meaning, as derived from the results of these inquiries is all with which our work, and our responsibility, as exegetists and interpreters have to do. The critic may discuss its truth or falsity, the theologian its place in his system of Divinity. These may come after or before the exegesis ; may be its stimulus or its reward, but they must *in no case be an intruding element in its calm study and judicial utterance*. We cordially accept these principles as the sole proper basis for a wise and really safe study of the Holy Scriptures, and have only the warmest commendations for all those portions of the Book which are concerned with the discussion of the spirit, and methods of exegetical study, and interpretation. We have seen no book in our language that gives them so concisely and so well, and while guarding young students on the points to which we have taken our exceptions above, we regard it as a valuable addition to our apparatus for this fundamental study of all studies to the theologian and the preacher.

J. F. G.

DEERHAVEN. By Sarah O. Jewett. *Fifth Edition* BOSTON : JAMES R. OSGOOD & Co. 1877. pp. 255.

We do not wonder that a *fifth edition* of this little volume has been

called for. We have seldom read a more charming book of its kind. Deephaven is a type of a quiet New England seaport, whose commerce has departed, but which retains quaint old-time relics of its days of prosperity; and where linger old inhabitants who love to tell of events gone by, and laid-up sailors full of yarns. Two Boston girls go down to spend the Summer in an old family mansion, and one of them writes of what they saw and heard. There is no story in it, and yet it interests. There is something in the simple, pure style and quiet humor, combined with occasional pathos, which reminds us of Washington Irving. We quote from the description of the first Sunday in church:

The singing was very droll for there was a majority of old voices, which had seen their best days long before, and the bass-viol was excessively noticeable, and apt to be a little ahead of the time the singers kept, while the violin lingered after. Somewhere on the other side of the church we heard an acute voice which rose high above all the rest of the congregation, sharp as a needle, and slightly cracked, with a limitless supply of breath. It rose and fell gallantly, and clung long to the high notes of Dundee. It was like the wail of the banshee, which sounds clear to the fated hearer above all other noises. We afterwards became acquainted with the owner of this voice, and were surprised to find her a meek widow, who was like a thin black beetle in her pathetic cypress veil and big black bonnet. She looked as if she had forgotten who she was, and spoke with an apologetic whine; but we have heard she had a temper as high as her voice, and as much to be dreaded as the equinoctial gale.

We wish we had space for long extracts from the exquisitely pathetic chapter "In Shadow." The concluding sentence will give some idea of the author's descriptive powers. There has been a funeral of a poor man, and the family are dispersed;

I think to-day of that fireless, empty, forsaken house where the Winter sun shines and creeps slowly along the floor, the bitter cold is in and around the house, and the snow has sifted in at every crack; outside it is untrodden by any living creature's footstep. The wind blows and rushes and shakes the loose window-sashes in their frames, while the padlock knocks—knocks against the door.

Our readers will find this book well suited for perusal these Winter evenings.

CHRISTIAN ASPECTS OF TRUTH AND DUTY. *Discourses by John James Taylor; Late Principal of Manchester New College, London.* BOSTON: ROBERTS BROTHERS. pp. 346. \$1.00.

These discourses are ably written and contain some very beautiful passages concerning the spiritual life, immortality and duty. But we cannot approve their teachings, denying as they do the Catholic Doctrines of

the Divinity of Christ and the Personality of the Holy Spirit. The author, in Sermon II, gives his theory of the Divinity of Christ, that it consists in the "harmony of an entire moral being with God," and that those "who are stirred up by his holy example to do like things and to live in the same spirit" may gradually become Divine. But this is not the Christ fallen humanity needs. Beautiful precepts and even holy example have not power to change the heart. We want a living Advocate, a personal Intercessor, a God manifest in the flesh, to take away our sins; an indwelling Spirit, not only to teach us what things we ought to do, but also "to give us grace and power faithfully to fulfill the same." The real cause of all this erroneous teaching is the failure to see and acknowledge the sinfulness of human nature. True, the writer talks of sins, and there is an excellent sermon on "Small Sins," which we all might read with profit. But there seems to be no consciousness of the truth which lies at the foundation of St. Paul's theology; "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." (Rom. iii; 23, 24.) And those who have felt this fact of their sinfulness and need of a Redeemer in reading this and kindred works, while appreciating the beautiful thoughts, and profiting by the wise precepts for holy living, will be conscious of a want, will feel that such a religion, ignoring the great fact of sinful humanity, does not and cannot satisfy the cravings of their hearts.

SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF ARCHBISHOP FENELON. *Letters to Women.*
RIVINGTONS, LONDON. POTT, YOUNG & CO., NEW YORK. 1877. pp.
294.

The writings of the Archbishop of Cambrai are so well known that it is entirely unnecessary for us to do more than explain the character of this book. It contains one hundred and thirty-eight extracts from letters written by Fenelon to various women who were under his *spiritual direction*. Whatever may be our ideas on the subject of such direction in general, these letters contain excellent advice, and are written in a truly evangelical spirit. Fenelon's Romanism was of so mild a type and the selections are so judiciously made, that no one need be afraid of finding anything to offend in this book.

- That the translation is made by the author of "Bossuet and his contemporaries" is sufficient to ensure that it is well done.

SUMMUS CORDA. *Hymns for the Sick and Suffering. Compiled by the Editor of "Quiet Hours," etc.* BOSTON: ROBERTS BROTHERS. 1877. pp. 316. \$1.25.

"This volume is intended for all who need comfort and strength, and especially for invalids." The selections "range from the Greek church of the eighth century to the present day." The hymns given are all beautiful and appropriate, but in looking them over we cannot help noticing the absence of evangelical hymns, we mean such as teach the Divinity, or atonement of Christ, or contain prayer to Him. We do not know if it is done intentionally, but it is significant, that in Charles Wesley's hymn "O Love Divine," in the last line of the first stanza which ought to read "The Love of Christ to me," the word "Christ" is changed to "God." We miss some of our old favorites, but find some exquisite ones, new to us. The book is light, the print clear. It is well suited to while away the tedium of a sick room.

OUR WORK FOR CHRIST AMONG HIS SUFFERING PEOPLE. *A book for Hospital Nurses, by M. A. Morell.* RIVINGTONS, LONDON. POTT, YOUNG & Co., NEW YORK. 1877. pp. 156.

An excellent little book which ought to be put into the hands of all nurses. It sets forth forcibly the religious principles by which they ought to be animated, and contains most valuable teachings and rules for their conduct. It is not intended especially for the use of Sisters, but of nurses both in hospitals and in private families. Indeed it may be studied with advantage by any parents or friends, who have the care of the sick.

SELECTIONS FROM EPICTETUS. BOSTON: ROBERTS BROTHERS. 1877. pp. 150.

This is one of the pocket size "Wisdom Series" which Roberts Brothers are publishing. Epictetus lived in the first century of our era. His writings on morals are among the wisest of those of the heathen philosophers. These "selections" present us with some of his most striking passages in a convenient form; and enable the general reader to obtain a good idea of his merits.

IMAGINARY CONVERSATIONS. *By Walter Savage Landor. Fifth Series, Miscellaneous Dialogues. (Concluded).* BOSTON: ROBERTS BROTHERS. 1877. pp. 547.

This fifth volume concludes the republication of Landor's Conversations.

We have already called the attention of our readers to the previous volumes. In these last dialogues people of different ages and countries are represented as conversing, and thus opportunity is afforded for some sharp strokes of wit and sarcasm. At the end of this volume is a full *Index* to the whole series, which adds greatly to its value.

ARTIST BIOGRAPHIES. TITIAN. BOSTON: JAMES R. OSGOOD & CO. 1877. pp. 160. 50c.

There seems to be at present among publishers a fashion for series. And here we have the first of a new series of the lives of artists, in a cheap and compact form. Almost every one knows the great artists by name, but few know anything of their lives, or of their chief pictures and where they are to be found; nor is this information easily to be obtained. The series begins with Titian, the celebrated Venetian artist. We have a well written and sufficiently minute account of his life, and of his principal pictures, and in the appendix is given a list of those "now in existence, the date of their execution, and present locations." We predict for this series a wide sale. The idea is a good one, and a real want of the reading public is thus supplied.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY. LIVES OF LORD HERBERT OF CHERBURY AND THOMAS ELLWOOD. *With Essays by William D. Howells.* BOSTON. JAMES R. OSGOOD & CO. 1877. pp. 369. \$1.25.

Another series of interesting books. "It is designed to include in it the famous autobiographies of all languages, in a compact and desirable form." If the Editor does all his work as well as he has done this one volume, the new series will be a great success. The two whose lives of themselves are here given, were nearly contemporaries, the first dying in 1649 and the second in 1713; Ellwood being an infant at the breaking out of the great Rebellion, and Herbert living some ten years after.

We can scarcely conceive of any two men whose lives and principles were more entirely different, and yet in character there was a strong re-

semblance; and the Editor has shown good judgment in placing their lives in the same volume. Both were men of a chivalrous disposition, brave and fearless in expressing their opinions, both of a literary turn of mind and equally poor as poets. They are good examples of the great effect which belief has upon the life, and how differently men of the same general character but under different religious influences will act under somewhat similar circumstances.

EDWARD LORD HERBERT came of good family, and had a good education, inheriting from his father a sufficient landed property. After mentioning his University career he gives a long and quaint description of what he considers necessary to constitute a solid education of mind and body; which certainly does not err on the side of requiring too little. He married at fifteen, for family reasons, a lady six years older than himself. At twenty-five he desired to go "beyond sea, that I might satisfy that curiosity I long since had to see foreign countries." His wife refusing to accompany him, he parted from her in some displeasure and little more is said of her. The amusing and interesting part of his life begins with these first travels. We have a vivid picture of a Soldier and Courtier of the day, zealous for his own and his country's honor, always ready to fight, generous to those in distress, shrewd in reading character, and a keen observer of men and things, yet withal full of vanity and overflowing with a sense of personal importance. All these traits come out unconsciously as it were, in the narrative. Herbert filled in his time several important trusts: he was ambassador from James I of England to Louis XIII of France on two occasions, on the latter being sent to conclude the marriage between Charles I and Henrietta Maria. The autobiography unfortunately ends at this point. The reader will find both instruction and entertainment in this life, for as Lord Herbert travelled widely through France, the Low Countries and Italy, mingled with the principal men of his time, and was, as we have said, a keen observer, his remarks give us a fuller knowledge of men and manners than the histories do. While his anecdotes of his own adventures, full of a harmless rodomontade, cannot but entertain.

THOMAS ELLWOOD moved in an entirely different circle, and his experiences were of altogether another kind from those of Lord Herbert. His father came of a respectable family, and was possessed of some property. Thomas received the usual education of his class, and showed signs of a high and manly spirit, as appears from an account he gives of an encounter with two men when he was yet a youth, in which he nearly killed an oppo-

nent and says he was resolved to kill, "if I could, any man that should put any affront upon us." Shortly after this, however, falling into the society of those called Quakers, he soon became so carried away by their preaching that he adopted their views and cast in his lot with them. He gives a minute account which provokes a smile, even while we honor his candor and courage, of the martyrdom he suffered because he thought it right to take off "those unnecessary trimmings of lace, ribbons and useless buttons which had no real service," and because he could no longer say "sir" or "madam." But his chief trouble arose from his unwillingness to pay respect by uncovering his head, even to his own father, or to use "that senseless way of speaking *you* to one, which hath greatly debased the spirits and depraved the manners of men." This so enraged his father, as showing in his opinion a want of respect, that "he violently snatched off *his* hat and threw it away, giving *him* some buffets upon *his* head and now and then a whirret on the ear," and at last compelled obedience by taking away and hiding all his head coverings. But while we smile at such petty troubles we cannot but admire and honor the constancy with which the Quakers of that day, as shown in this biography—for the sake of principle—endured contumely and serious outrage, imprisonment and stripes. We ought to be thankful that our lot has been cast in a period when we are not called on to endure persecution for conscience sake. It would be well if we all were as firm and consistent as were these men. The conduct of Ellwood in defending from insult the young and beautiful Quakeress Guli Penington, afterward the wife of William Penn, shows that he possessed courage and presence of mind, and the spirit to protect the weak, even when his principles forbade him to fight. This biography ends abruptly, as does the other, and leaves us wishing for more.

One only criticism and that addressed to the publishers. This highly calendered paper reflects the light unpleasantly, it is beautiful to look at but very trying to the eye.

BRING A BOY. *By Charles Dudley Warner. Illustrated by "Champ."*
 BOSTON: JAMES R. OSGOOD & Co. 1878. pp. 244. \$1.50.

Every man who has been a boy—some men never were "boys"—every woman who when a girl ever wished to be a boy, and what girl of spirit has not, ought to read this book that they may be rejuvenated. We say nothing about boys and girls reading it, for though it looks as if meant for a child's book we very much doubt if it be, and we are sure no child can

possibly enjoy it as much as the grown-up folk. As the writer shrewdly remarks, a boy has no sense of humor, and this book is full of humor. A boy will like the fun in it but he will not appreciate the sly cuts at himself as will his father and mother. So, if you get this book as a Christmas present for your boy, be sure to read it first yourselves. We give you the opening sentence :

One of the best things in the world to be is a boy ; it requires no experience, though it needs some practice to be a good one. The disadvantage of the position is that it does not last long enough ; it is soon over ; just as you get used to being a boy, you have to be something else, with a good deal more work to do and not half so much fun.

The illustrations are very well done ; we must make one exception, the only fault we find in the book. The initial letter of Chapter XVI is shockingly irreverent. We hope that in the new edition, which must soon be called for, the publishers will have it changed.

FAITH AND PHILOSOPHY : *Discourses and Essays by Henry B. Smith, D. D., LL. D. Edited with an Introductory Notice by George L. Prentiss, D. D.* NEW YORK : SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG AND CO. 1877. Large 8vo. pp. 496. \$3.50.

These Essays by the late Professor of Systematic Theology in the "Union Theological Seminary" of New York, deserve a fuller notice than the crowded pages of this number of the REVIEW can allow. They may be considered in some respects as the exponent of the views of modern Presbyterianism. The first Discourse on "The Relations of Faith and Philosophy" is excellent, full of deep thoughts tersely expressed. Some of the sentences are truly aphoristic, as for instance :

What faith is to the believer, that, as has been said, his system is apt to become to the philosopher.

Many a philosopher * * * loving law, forgets the source of its energy ; resting in his system, he thinks not of God.

Our philosophical infidels * * * accept the philosophic horn of the dilemma, philosophy or faith ; until they can see that the formula should read, faith and philosophy.

Man is a believer, made to trust. The infirmities of his finite, and the necessities, of his sinful condition, make faith necessary to the attainment of the great ends of his being.

A danger of the New England subjective theology is that it teaches * * * God is for man, rather than man for God.

Though this address was delivered as long ago as 1849, it is just as useful now as then. We wish we had room for the eloquent passage with which it ends. The discourse on "Church History" is also very good ; on page 72 will be found an excellent setting forth of the value of that study ; and on page 80 a vivid and fair account of the Church of Rome,

beginning with this axiom : "The strength of Rome is in its completeness and consistency, as an organic system," followed by suggestions how history is the best means of refuting its claims. We also call attention to the essay reprinted from "*The American Theological Review*," for April, 1861, on the once famous "Essays and Reviews," by certain English Churchmen. The article on "Reformed Churches of Europe and America" cannot be so cursorily passed over, and we have not space to criticise it now. We can only say of this and some of the other Essays in which we might find something from which we should dissent, that everything such a man as Doctor Henry B. Smith has written deserves careful consideration. We cannot close this brief notice without thanking the publishers for the beautiful manner in which this and other of their books are printed.

THE QUEEN OF SHEBA. *Thomas Bailey Aldrich.* BOSTON : JAMES R. OSGOOD & Co. 1877. pp. 270. \$1.50.

This book takes its name from the heroine who while temporarily insane, imagines herself the Queen of Sheba. We cannot give a sketch of it without forestalling the interest of the story, which we must therefore leave our readers to trace out for themselves, and this they will not find it difficult nor unpleasant to do.

THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS, *by William G. T. Shedd, D. D., Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York.* NEW YORK : SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG AND CO. 1877. pp. 383. \$2.59.

These Essays, like those just noticed, are brought together and reprinted in one volume, having been delivered or published at various periods during the last thirty years. They treat more or less of subjects connected with Theological Teaching, especially Church History. Rightly enough the two Professors who have filled, in the Union Theological Seminary, the chair of Systematic Theology, believe that this may be best taught by the History of the Church. We do not mean that they expressly say so, but we gather this to be their feeling from the tendency of their writings. The Essay on "The Idea of Evolution defined and applied to History" is less strictly theological and more philosophical than the others, setting forth the difference between a true and a false theory of Evolution. We commend the discourse on "Clerical Education" to our own students ; indeed those in Orders may receive benefit from its perusal.

BIOLOGY, with *Preludes on Current Events*. By Joseph Cook. BOSTON : JAMES R. OSGOOD AND CO. 1877. pp. 325. \$1.50.

TRANSCENDENTALISM, with *Preludes on Current Events*. By Joseph Cook. BOSTON : JAMES R. OSGOOD AND CO. 1877. pp. 305. \$1.50.

These are two volumes of the "Boston Monday Lectures." They have been so widely circulated and so frequently noticed in the papers that it is sufficient for us at present to call attention to this well printed edition of them. The great secret of Mr. Cook's success we gather from these books to be—a thorough familiarity with what has been written on the subjects discussed, a clearness of statement and a dogmatic setting forth of his own conclusions. He does not say "it may be thus and so," but "it is so," and he is generally right. Add to this great skill in showing up the contradictions of those he is controverting, and we can understand the influence these Lectures have had. We believe they have done much good. Mr. Cook will be wise if he confine himself to those subjects of which he has made a specialty; we think we see in the *Preludes* a tendency to go beyond these.

SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF ARCHBISHOP FENELON. *Letters to Men*. NEW YORK : E. P. DUTTON AND CO. 1877. pp. 352.

We have already noticed the "Letters to Women" by Fenelon; and as we said of that so we repeat of this, that while there are a few things said with which we cannot agree, yet the Romanism of Fenelon was very different from that of to-day, and there is so much good advice given that we can safely commend the book with this word of caution, to remember that it was written by a Romanist. We note, by the way, and commend to the attention of some in our own Church, that Fenelon quotes both S.S. Ambrose and Augustine as teaching, regarding the Eucharist, that "there is no offering without communicating." "We offend against the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ when we join with the Priest in offering it without being willing also to join in eating thereof," p. 348.

The same publishers have issued a cheap edition of "The Letters to Women."

"ONLY A CAT;" or, *The Autobiography of Tom Blackman*. By Mrs. H. B. PAULL. NEW YORK : T. WHITTAKER. 1878. pp. 281.

Among the best books for children we have examined we place this life of a cat. The story is well told, the teaching is good yet not too good. Especially we like it because it inculcates, in so pleasant a way, kindness to animals. The illustrations and binding make it very attractive.

VISIONS OF HEAVEN *for the Life on Earth.* By Robert M. Patterson.
PHILADELPHIA PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION: pp. 364. \$1.50.

An interesting book, telling us all that Scripture reveals of the world to come, and by it setting forth clearly the state of mind and manner of life here, needed to fit us for a blissful future. The following sentence sets forth, we think, the general tenor of the writer's argument. He is speaking of the spiritual life here and hereafter.

Each influences the other. The divine revelations of the future, apprehended by an active faith, inspire and fashion the Christian life of the present; the life here, as it is formed and developed by the grace of God, projects itself into the hereafter.

There is much suggested which will comfort the suffering and the mourner.

LIVE QUESTIONS IN PSYCHOLOGY AND METAPHYSICS. By Professor W. D. Wilson. NEW YORK: D. APPLETON AND CO. 1877. pp. 164. 75c.

Six Lectures "delivered to the classes in Cornell University," containing Dr. Wilson's latest thoughts on the subjects of Sensation, Consciousness, Volition, Insight, the Test of Truth, Real Causes. Another contribution to setting forth the harmony of science and religion. Though small, this book is full of thought and the subjects it treats are of great importance, but we cannot now give it the attention it deserves. We quote the closing paragraph as showing the conclusions to which the Author's investigations lead him:

In the course of this evolution, the two, science and religion, must again unite and be in harmony; religion, accepting every truth and fact of science, as a part of the divine administration; and science recognizing the truths of revelation as its necessary complement and crowning glory.

Dr. Wilson is so well known to the readers of the CHURCH REVIEW as a vigorous writer that his name will be to them a sufficient guarantee of the worth of this treatise.

WINDFALLS. By Thomas G. Appleton. BOSTON: ROBERTS BROTHERS. 1877. pp. 364. \$1.50.

A collection of short essays, narratives or stories, written very pleasantly, and well calculated to help pass a leisure hour. One, "The Slave States," is more serious than the others, and will repay perusal.

WAYS OF THE SPIRIT, and other Essays. By Frederick Henry Hedge. BOSTON: ROBERTS BROTHERS. 1877. pp. 367. \$2.00.

A series of essays on the topics now receiving so much attention—History, Theism, The Origin of Things, Pantheism, etc. Received too late for a critical notice.

WHAT MARRIAGES ARE LAWFUL? *An enquiry addressed to the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church.* By W. F. Brand, Rector of St. Mary's Church, Harford Co., Md. NEW YORK: T. WHITTAKER, pp. 66.

Published with "the hearty concurrence" of the Bishop of Maryland, and therefore worthy the serious consideration of all members of the Church. The writer takes the ground that the Law of the English Church regarding marriages within certain degrees is binding on us. He then investigates that law and shows that it is conformed to the canons of the ancient church, dwelling especially on the question of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, which he thinks contrary to both the Jewish and Christian law. His arguments are strong, but though we agree with him as to the undesirableness of such a marriage, we do not think he has noticed all that might be said in its favor. He has not considered what St. Paul has said of the law of marriage (Rom. vii.2,3.); nor what is said by a text book of authority in this country, "Bishop on Marriage and Divorce," I. 314, note, as to the ceasing of the affinity with the death of either of the parties.

THE NEW ENGLAND MINISTRY SIXTY YEARS AGO. *The Memoir of John Woodbridge, D. D.* By Sereno D. Clark. BOSTON: LEE & SHEPARD. NEW YORK: CHARLES T. DILLINGHAM. 1877. pp. 473. \$2.00.

The study of New England theology and its results is one of the most interesting presented by the religious phases of our country. Its history has yet to be written. We are now only collecting materials for it; and biographies will form an important element of these. In no part of the Christian world has the right of private judgment been more fully asserted. Nowhere else has a more pretentious dogmatism been maintained; and we may add nowhere else have more radical changes been made in doctrine and discipline. This book will aid the future historian in his work. Dr. John Woodbridge was born in Southampton, Mass., December 2, 1784. After devoting a short time to the study of law he changed for that of the ministry, and was trained in the views of the strongest Calvinism. With the exception of a short period in charge of the Bowery Church, New York, his whole ministry was in New England. He died in 1869, so that his active life embraced the most interesting portion of the present century as regards the religious changes referred to. As a man of strong belief and active intellect he took a deep interest in the controversies of the time. Much information regarding these may be obtained from a perusal of the book. There is very little of incident, it is almost entirely a history of thought and feeling. We cannot say that it will be found interesting to the general reader, such books seldom are.

A LATIN GRAMMAR, *founded on Comparative Grammar.* By J. H. Allen and J. B. Greenough. *Revised Edition.* BOSTON: GINN & HEATH. 1877.

This Grammar is so well known that we need only call attention to the changes which have been made in this revised edition. The matter has been arranged in chapters instead of sections, the former sections being noted in the margin; the portions on Phonetic Changes, and the Formation of Words have been enlarged; a good deal of new matter on philology and syntax has been introduced in the form of notes; and new illustrations have been given in the Prosody. All this adds greatly to the value of the Grammar. Like all other books by this firm the paper and print are excellent.

THE CHURCH ALMANAC *for the year of our Lord, 1878.* NEW YORK: POTT, YOUNG AND CO.

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL ALMANAC AND DIRECTORY, *for the year of our Lord, 1878.* T. WHITTAKER, NEW YORK.

Both the Church Almanacs have made their appearance with the usual punctuality. No Churchman can do without them. Few realize the great labor and care involved in getting them up; and very few study out the mass of information contained in them. When both are so good it would be invidious to distinguish. They have necessarily a great deal in common; each has some special features of value. Dr. Farrington, the editor of the first, is very careful and accurate in obtaining the names of the clergy, and his selections at the foot of the calendar pages from the addresses of the Bishops are admirably selected. Whittaker's Almanac gives a list of the Dominion clergy, and he has introduced a new feature by printing the names of living Bishops in fuller type. He tells us in the preface that he hopes now that "a remarkable degree of union and harmony pervades all sections of the Church" to be able before long to make this a "Year book." The publication of these Almanacs should be encouraged and the best way to do this is to buy both. They are excellent tracts.

THE STORY OF AVIS. *By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, Author of "The Gates Ajar."* BOSTON: JAMES R. OSGOOD & Co. 1877. pp. 457. \$1.59.

As it takes all sorts of people to make a world, so it takes all sorts of books to make a literature, and every book worth anything finds readers and admirers. There is a class, and we believe sufficiently numerous, who admire excessively the writings of Miss E. S. Phelps, and

hail the publication of this book as a great addition to the literature of our country. We confess that we are not to be counted among these. Undoubtedly there is much to admire in this work; many fine passages in it and great talent shown; but we are speaking of the book as a whole, of its style and tendencies. In the first place the chief characters are unnatural. Some people like unnatural characters: we do not. The story is drawn out and becomes tedious. There is no particular thread to it, no point, no moral. We like a novel which is something of a drama, has a plot, leads you on in expectation and interest to the end. Or else that the characters should be gradually developing and keep up the interest in watching their growth. But in the "Story of Avis" there is very little story, and the hero and heroine lose their interest in one another so soon after marriage and become so indifferent to each other and to everything else that we soon cease to care much what becomes of them.

Avis is represented as a young lady with great artistic talents, with sufficient perseverance and love for work to ensure success. She studies under good masters in Italy and France until Couture, her instructor, comes to her studio and says: "Mademoiselle, I will give you two years to make a reputation." This was after six years of hard labor. She returns to her New England home to work out this "reputation." Her home is in a town with a college in it, situated near the sea; and some of the best passages in the book are the descriptions of the life in such a town and of the sea and land views.

THE BIOGRAPHY OF ALFRED DE MUSSET. *Translated from the French of Paul de Musset by Harriet W. Preston.* BOSTON: ROBERTS BROS. 1877. pp. 318.

This work is well worthy of a more extended notice than we have time to give. The number and variety as well as the merits of many of the books sent to us for review at this season have compelled the omission of some that deserve careful and favorable criticism. This must be our apology for brief allusion to the book in question.

[SUPPLEMENT.]

ORDINATIONS FOR THE YEAR ENDING ADVENT, 1877.

The Editor desires to thank the Bishops who have kindly sent him their Ordination statistics. The list given below is authentic, being either furnished by the Bishops themselves, or, in a few instances, taken from their Convention Reports. In the latter case an asterisk is affixed to the name of the Diocese. No ordinations are inserted unless thus obtained.

*Signifies Baptist. + Congregational. ++ Seventh-Day Baptist. ‡ Methodist. ‡‡ Unitarian.
|| Presbyterian. (°) Lutheran. (a) Deaf Mute. (b) Sioux. (c) Adventist.

ALABAMA. (R. H. Wilmer.)

| Date. | Name | Place. |
|-------------|-----------------|--------|
| May 6, '77. | Peter Wager, P. | |

ALBANY. (Doane.)

| | | |
|---------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Dec. 21, '76. | J. Sydney Kent, P. | St. Luke's, Cambridge |
| Jan. 4, '77. | John Dolby Skene, D. | St. Mark's, Hoosac Falls |
| 24. | Charles Edwin Cragg, D. | Christ Church, Port Henry |
| | Charles Arthur Bragdon, P. | " " |
| May 25, | Wm. Morton Pickslay, D. | St. John Evangelist, Barrytown |
| " 31, | Scott Bogie Rathbun, " | St. Paul's, Franklin |
| June 11, | Richard Clinton Searing, " | Bethesda Church, Saratoga |
| " | Anson J. Brockway, P. | " |
| " | Earnest A. Hartman, " | " |
| " | Frederic O. Grannis, " | " |
| " | Charles S. Olmstead, " | " |
| June 24, | Robert Granger, D. | The Cathedral |
| Aug. 23, | J. R. L. Nisbett, " | Trinity Church, Potsdam |
| 28, | Wm. Mason Cooke, " | St. Paul's Church, Keeseville |
| Sept. 21, | Wm. Henry Beardsley, " | The Cathedral |
| Nov. 30, | Frank Smith, " | St. Peter's, Albany |

CENTRAL NEW YORK. (*Huntington.*)

| | | | |
|----------|-----------------------|----|--|
| | F. B. A. Lewis, M. D. | D. | |
| | C. A. Poole. | " | |
| | W. L. Mott. | " | |
| | C. W. McNish. | " | |
| | J. S. Lemon. † | " | |
| | J. A. Farrar. † | " | |
| | G. W. Gates, M. D. * | " | |
| | W. F. Hubbard | P. | |
| | John Muir. | " | |
| | B. T. Hall. | " | |
| June 27, | James Barton Finn. | " | |

CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA. (*M. A. De W. Howe.*)

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|----|-----------------------------|
| March 28, '77. | Samuel K. Boyer. * | D. | Christ Cathedral |
| Dec. 20, '76. | Le Roy F. Baker. | P. | St. Luke's, Scranton |
| Sept. 20, '77. | S. C. Thompson. | " | Church of the Good Shepherd |
| Nov. 22, | Henry Paschal Chapman. | P. | Christ Cathedral |
| " " | John D. Rockwell. | P. | " " |

CONNECTICUT. (*Williams.*)

| | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--------|------------------------------|
| Dec. 12, '76. | Alex. Mackay Smith. | D. | St. Paul's, New Haven |
| April 13, '77. | Clarence Winship Colton. | P. | Christ Church, Bethany |
| May, 26. | Heman R. Timlow. † | " | St. James', Westville |
| " 30. | William Merrick Chapin. | D. | " " |
| " " | Henry Townsend Scudder. | " | Holy Trinity, Middletown |
| " " | William Lancaster McEwan. | " | " " |
| " " | Charles Ewell Craik. | " | " " |
| " " | Percival Hanahan Whaley. | " | " " |
| " " | William Bohler Walker. | " | " " |
| June 7. | Charles Hayden Proctor. | P. | St. Peter's, Cheshire |
| " " | William Howard Bulkley. | " | " " |
| " " | Nathan Kendrick Bishop. | " | " " |
| " " | William Barnard Coleman. | " | " " |
| " " | Frederick William Harriman. | " | " " |
| " " | John Mallory Bates. | " | " " |
| " " | Oliver Henry Raftery | " | " " |
| June 24. | Henry Evan Colton. | D. | St. John's Hartford |
| " 25. | James Heartt Van Buren. | P. | St. Peter's, Milford |
| July 3. | Elbert Burr Taylor. | P. | Christ Church, Middle Haddam |
| " 10. | Isaac Chauncey Sturgis. | P. | Trinity, Newtown |
| " " | Francis Walter Barnett. | " | " " |
| " 11. | Alexander Hamilton Vinton. | 2d, D. | St. John's, Stamford |

DELAWARE. (*Lee.*)

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------------------|----|-------------------------|
| Sept. 23, '77. | William McCauley Jefferis. | D. | Trinity Church, Wilm'tn |
|----------------|----------------------------|----|-------------------------|

EASTON. (*Lay.*)

| | | | |
|-------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| May 8, '77. | Wordsworth Young Beaven. | " | Christ Church, Easton |
|-------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------------|

FOND DU LAC. (*Brown.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|----|----------------------|
| July 22. '77. | Henry Thompson. | D. | St. Paul's Cathedral |
|---------------|-----------------|----|----------------------|

ILLINOIS. (*Mc Laren.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------|----|--------------------|
| Dec. 31, '76. | William J. O'Brien. | D. | Cathedral, Chicago |
| May 27, '77. | Nils Nordene. | " | " |
| " | D. J. Odell, Jr. | " | " |
| " | William W. Steel. | P. | " |
| " | Geo. W. Morrill. †† | " | " |
| Nov. 25. | D. J. Odell, Jr. | " | " |

INDIANA. (*Talbot.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|----|--|
| Dec. 27, '76. | Samuel Campbell Montgomery Orpen. | P. | |
| " | Gustav Arnold Carstensen. | " | |
| Jan. 7, '77. | Charles John Clausen. | | |
| May 1, | William Fletcher Dickinson. | D. | |
| " 11. | Joseph Gorton Miller. | P. | |
| July 17. | John Jacob Faude. | D. | |
| Nov. 22. | Alfred Thomas Perkins. | P. | |
| " 29. | James Langhorne Boxer. * | D. | |

KENTUCKY. (*Dudley, Assistant.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------|----|------------------------|
| Dec. 19, '76. | Richard Page. | D. | Trinity, Covington |
| May 27, '77. | George W. Flowers. | P. | St. Paul's, Louisville |
| July 3, | Charles Harry Lockwood. | D. | Calvary, " |
| " | Ralph Erville Mc Duff. | " | " |

LONG ISLAND. (*Littlejohn.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------|----|--|
| Jan. 14, '77. | Robert Bayard Snowden. | D. | |
| May 27. | Joseph Beers. | " | |
| " | John Cornwell Wellwood. | " | |
| " | Lindall W. Saltonstall. | " | |
| " | Richard L. Tighe. | P. | |
| " | George Harris Chadwell. | " | |
| " | Thomas Benj. Fulcher. | " | |

LOUISIANA. (*J. P. B. Wilmer.*)

| | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|----|----------------------|
| May 30, '77. | Melvill Maury Moore. | P. | Trinity, New Orleans |
| | Isaac Newton Marks, Jr. | D. | " |
| Nov. 11. | Charles H. Thompson. | D. | St. Philip's, " |

MAINE. (*Neely.*)

| | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|----|---------------------|
| Dec. 8, '76. | Arthur Herbert Locke. | D. | St. Mark's, Augusta |
| May 27, '77. | Edwin Francis Small. | " | Cathedral, Portland |
| " | Rodney Miller Edwards. | " | " |
| " | Charles Edwin Fitz. | " | " |
| " | Harry Pierce Nichols. | P. | " |

MARYLAND. (*Whittingham.*)

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|----|--|
| May 27, '77. | William Richmond. | D. | |
| " | Robert Henry Gernand. | " | |
| " | William Foster Morrison. | P. | |
| " | Oliver Perry Vinton. | " | |

MASSACHUSETTS. (*Paddock.*)

| | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|----|-----------------------|
| June 5, '77. | Wm. Franklin Cheney. | P. | Good Shepherd, Dedham |
| " | John Douglass McConkey. | " | " |
| " | William H. Groton. | " | " |
| " | George Rogers Wheelock. | " | " |
| " | Thomas Jones Mackay. | " | " |
| " 20. | John Taylor Rose. | D. | St. John's, Cambridge |
| " | George Endicott Osgood. | " | " |
| " | Edwin Walter Gould. | " | " |
| " | Walter Baker. | " | " |

*MICHIGAN. (*McCoskery.*)

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|----|--------------------|
| March 29, '77. | Samuel B. Carpenter. | P. | St. James' Detroit |
|----------------|----------------------|----|--------------------|

MINNESOTA. (*Whipple.*)

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|----|--|
| Feb. 2, '77. | Edwin Gustavus Hunter | P. | |
| June 17. | James Gurley. † | " | |
| " | Joseph L. Berne. | " | |
| " | William T. Pise. | D. | |
| " | Theodore C. Hudson. | " | |
| " | Frederick James Tassell. | " | |
| " | Joseph G. Lawrence. | " | |
| " | Edwin Benedict. | " | |
| July 15. | George Johnson. | " | |
| " | Charles Wright. | " | |

*MISSISSIPPI. (*Green.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|----|-----------------|
| Dec. 11, '76. | Joseph W. Turner. | P. | Nativity, Macon |
|---------------|-------------------|----|-----------------|

MISSOURI. (*Robertson.*)

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|----|---------------------------|
| March 21, '77. | Edward Lewis. * | D. | Christ, St. Louis |
| May 27, | Chas. H. De Garmo. | P. | Grace, Kansas City |
| June 9, | R. E. G. Huntington. † | " | Trinity, Kirksville |
| Aug. 16. | E. Victor Beales * | " | Holy Communion, St. Louis |

NEBRASKA. (*Clarkson.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|----------------------|----|-------------------------|
| Sept. 9, '77. | W. P. Huntington. †† | P. | Christ, Yankton, Dakota |
|---------------|----------------------|----|-------------------------|

*NEW HAMPSHIRE. (*Niles.*)

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|----|---------------------------|
| April 25, '77. | James Hardin George, | P. | St. Stephen's, Pittsfield |
| June 20, | Henry Harrison Haynes. | D. | St. John's Memorial |
| | | | Chapel, Cambridge, Mass |
| June 24, | Howard Fremont Hill. | P. | St. Paul's Concord |

NEW JERSEY. (*Scarborough.*)

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|----|-------------------------|
| May 27, '77. | J. Philip B. Pendleton. | D. | Trinity Church, Trenton |
| " | William Crawford Wilson. | " | " |

NEW YORK. (*Potter.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|----------------------------------|----|----------------------------------|
| Dec. 24. '76. | John Punnett Peters. | D. | Trinity Chapel |
| " | Henry Van Rensselaer. | " | " |
| " | William Westover. | " | " |
| " | Fred'k Henry Townsend Horsfield. | P. | " |
| " | George Wm. Douglas. | " | " |
| " | Julius Ungar. | D. | " |
| Feb. 25, '77 | Matthew A. Bailey, M. D. | " | Floating C'h of our Sav'r |
| " | Isaac Maguire. | P. | " |
| March 4. | George C. Athole. | P. | Chapel of Holy Innocents, Harlem |
| May 27. | Wm. Oliver Embury. | D. | Church of the Transfiguration |
| " | Harry J. Bodley. | " | " |
| " | John Quick Archdeacon. | " | " |
| " | Victor C. Smith. | " | " |
| " | Henry Robert Percival. | " | " |
| " | Andrew Trowbridge Sharp. | D. | " |
| " | Chas. Tileston Whittemore. | " | " |
| " | Joshua Newton Perkins. | " | " |
| " | N. Frazier Robinson. | P. | " |
| " | Charles Lancaster Short. | " | " |
| " | John Sword. | " | " |
| June 24, | William Henry Tomlins, | " | All Saints, Rosendale |
| Sept. 30, | Fred'k. Wm. Taylor. | P. | Church of the Transfiguration |

NORTH CAROLINA. (*Atkinson.*)

| | | | |
|--------------|-------------------|----|------------------------|
| June 3, '77. | Edwin A. Osborne. | D. | St. Peter's, Charlotte |
| July 29. | Edmund N. Joiner, | P. | Grace, Morganton |

NORTHERN NEW JERSEY. (*Odenheimer.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|----|---------------------|
| Dec. 10. '76. | Francis Pennington Mackall. | D. | Trinity, Newark |
| " 17. | S. Means. | P. | St. John's, Bayonne |
| Feb. 28, '77. | J. R. Sharp, Jr. | P. | St. Paul's, Hoboken |
| Sept. 30. | Chalmers Durand Chapman. | D. | Trinity, Irvington |

OHIO. (*Bedell.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------|----|--------------------|
| Jan. 25, '77. | Austin W. Mann. (a) | D. | Grace, Cleveland |
| April 24. | Joseph P. Cameron. | P. | St. Paul's, Canton |
| " 26. | Edwin W. Colloque. | P. | " Medina |
| June 24. | Lewis W. Burton. | D. | |

PENNSYLVANIA. (*Stevens.*)

| | | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|----|---------------------------|
| Feb. 4, '77 | John Cotton Brooks. | P. | St. James' Bristol |
| " 14. | Benjamin T. Hutchins. | P. | St. Barnabas, Kensington, |
| March 29. | James J. Creigh, | P. | Holy Trinity, Westchester |
| " | Mortimer T. Jefferis. | " | " |

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------|----|-----------------------------|
| June 21. '77. | Rodney Rush Swope. | P. | Chapel Holy Trinity, Phila. |
| " | George M. Bond, | " | " |
| " | Charles H. Kidder, | " | " |
| " | John W. Kaye, | " | " |
| " | Marshall T. Meigs, | " | " |
| " | Charles B. Crawford, | " | " |
| " | George F. Nelson. | D. | " |
| " | Langdon C. Stewardson, | " | " |
| " | Peter A. Morgan, | " | " |
| " | Alex. B. Carver. | " | " |
| " | Wm. H. Avery, | " | " |
| Dec. 16. | George S. Pine, | " | Church of Advent, Phila. |

*PITTSBURGH. (*Kerfoot.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|----|----------------------------|
| Feb. 23. '77. | Emelius W. Smith. | P. | St. Stephen's, Mc Keesport |
|---------------|-------------------|----|----------------------------|

*RHODE ISLAND. (*Niles, acting.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------|----|-----------------------------|
| Jan. 25. '77. | Lucius Waterman. | P. | St. Mary's, East Providence |
|---------------|------------------|----|-----------------------------|

*SOUTH CAROLINA. (*W. B. H. Howe.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|----|---------------------------------|
| Dec. 22, '76. | John Kershaw, | P. | St. Philip's Church, Charleston |
| May 27, '77. | Benjamin Allston, | D. | St. Michael's " " |
| July 22, | Edwin C. Steele, | " | St. Paul's " " |
| Dec. 21, | Wm. H. Barnwell, | " | Grace " " |

SOUTHERN OHIO, (*Jaggar.*)

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------------|----|--|
| May 6, '77 | Francis Key Brooke. | P. | |
| | Louis Shreve Osborne. | " | |

TEXAS. (*Gregg.*)

| | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|------|--------------------|
| March 11, '77. | John Whitfield Doremus. | † D. | Trinity, Galveston |
|----------------|-------------------------|------|--------------------|

VERMONT. (*Bissell.*)

| | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|----|------------------------|
| April 22, '77. | Lewis Augustus Arthur. | D. | St. Paul's, Burlington |
| " 25. | William Lloyd Himes. (e) | P. | " |
| June 24. | James Biggar Wasson. | D. | St. Paul's Burlington. |

VIRGINIA. (*Whittle.*)

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|----|------------------------|
| March 21, '77. | George C. Sutton. | D. | St. Paul's, Richmond |
| " | Pike Powers. | P. | " |
| June 29. | Peter M. Boyden. | D. | Chapel, Theo. Seminary |
| " | Oscar S. Bunting. | " | " |
| " | Nelson P. Dame. | " | " |
| " | Emile Julian Hall. | " | " |
| " | Edwin A. Penick. | " | " |
| " | Wm. W. Walker. | " | " |
| " | James R. Winchester. | " | " |
| " | Isaac K. Yokoyama. | " | " |
| " | Robert S. Barrett. | " | " |

ORDINATIONS TO ADVENT OF 1877.

vii

| | | | |
|----------|------------------------|----|------------------------|
| June 29. | Wm. S. Jones. | D. | Chapel, Theo. Seminary |
| " | Robert D. Roller. | " | " |
| " | Franklin Stringfellow. | " | " |
| " | John K. Mason. | " | " |
| " | Thomas Spencer. | " | " |
| " | George S. Gibbs. | " | " |
| " | John J. Gravatt. | P. | " |
| " | Robert F. Jackson, Jr. | " | " |
| Aug. 29. | Albert Ware. | " | St. Stephen's, Bedford |
| Sept. 9. | John McNabb. | " | Blacksburg |

WESTERN MICHIGAN. (*Gillespie.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------|----|--------------------------|
| Dec. 31, '76. | William H. Sparling. † | D. | St. James', Albion |
| June 13, '77. | William Matthias. † | P. | St. Andrew's, Big Rapids |

WESTERN NEW YORK. (*Coxe.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|
| Dec. 24, '76. | Richard Hogarth Dennis. | D. | St. James', Rochester |
| Feb. 24, '77. | Joseph Robert Love. | P. | St. Philip's, Buffalo |
| April 22. | Charles Friedrich Kellner. | o D. | Trinity, Geneva |
| May 27. | Joseph Wayne. † | " | " Le Roy |
| " | John William Greenwood. | P. | " " |

*WISCONSIN. (*Welles.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------|----|-----------|
| April 8, '77. | O. Parker. | P. | Cathedral |
| May 27. | C. D. Mack. | D. | " |

NIOBRARA. (*Hare.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|----|--|
| Dec. 3, '76. | Luke Charles Walker. (b) | P. | |
| June 24, '77. | Henry Swift. | " | |
| Nov. 25. | Edward Oakley, | D. | |

COLORADO. (*Spalding.*)

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|----|--------------------|
| Dec. 19, '76. | Duncan Convers. | P. | Christ, Cañon City |
|---------------|-----------------|----|--------------------|

WHITTAKER'S PUBLICATIONS OF UTILITY.

For Clergymen and Parish Work.

CALENDAR LEAFLETS for the use of Clergymen of the Church. Price 30 cents.

The convenience of these Leaflets will be seen at once. There is one for each Sunday in the year. They save the trouble of making out a memorandum for each service. Every order according to the Prayer Book is printed in its place; also the new English Lectionary permitted to be used by the General Convention.

WHITTAKER'S CHURCHMAN'S ALMANAC. 1878. Price, 25 cents.

*** Will have, in addition to all the varied information it now contains, several new features, among which will be the new Lent Lectionary authorized by the late General Convention, and the revised Lectionary of the Church of England. The steady growth of its circulation is a pleasing testimony to the publisher of the favor with which it is received among Churchmen. The greatest care has been taken to make it the most correct publication of its kind.

*** Ask your bookseller for *Whittaker's Churchman's Almanac*, or send to the publisher for it.

LESSON LEAFLETS FOR THE CHILDREN OF THE CHURCH. Edited by Rev. Geo. W. Shinn.

This leaflet combines simplicity with accuracy, and neatness of typography with cheapness of cost. Each lesson will be illustrated. Clergymen and Sunday-school workers are particularly invited to examine a few numbers, which will be mailed free on application.

The outline of lessons will be that recommended by the Committees of the Dioceses of New York, Pennsylvania, Long Island and New Jersey.

Terms: 12c. per copy for one year (52 lessons.)

Each four lessons issued together.

This Leaflet has elements of decided success.

THE PARISH VISITOR. An assistant for every Clergyman.

A strictly religious paper, containing short and interesting articles—some designed to arrest the careless, and others to encourage the believer; always purposing, with God's blessing, to further pure and religious life in those into whose hands it may come. It is admirably adapted, in every respect, for the family circle, over which it will exercise an elevating and refining influence. As to the usefulness of the *VISITOR* we have many and constant testimonies from all parts of the country. A department for children has lately been added, which greatly increases the interest.

One copy for one year, 50 cts.; ten copies, \$3.50; fifty copies, \$13.50; one hundred copies, \$25.00. Send for specimens.

OUR MARRIAGE VOW. The service and Minister's Certificate. 16mo, rubricated, cloth, gilt, 75 cents; plain leather, \$1.25; morocco, tuck, \$2.00; calf, tuck, \$2.00.

The book contains the marriage service printed in pica type, rubricated; the Homily on Marriage as published in the Prayer Book of the Church of England; the hymn "The voice that breath'd o'er Eden," and a blank certificate printed in two colors, thus making the volume a precious souvenir to the married couple, and a reminder of their vows and duties.

"This little volume, which costs no more than a neat certificate of the old-fashioned kind, is an appropriate gift for a clergyman to put in the hands of the groom. It also puts an important document into such shape that it cannot easily be mislaid or lost.—*Utica Morning Herald*.

"In its handsome cover is a pocket containing a pretty marriage certificate."—*The Churchman*.

PARISH TRACTS on Baptism, Communion, the Christian Life, and other kindred subjects in great variety. For titles and prices see our general catalogue, which will be mailed on application.

Correspondence solicited. T. Whittaker, 2 Bible House, New York.